3 1761 11652987 6

RB 11227



Library
of the
University of Toronto

HANDBOUND
AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF
TORONTO PRESS


Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
University of Toronto

https://archive.org/details/31761116529876

9047

ROYAL COMMISSION

ON

METROPOLITAN TORONTO

HEARINGS

HELD AT

PARLIAMENT BLDGS.
TORONTO

VOLUME No.:

16

DATE:

JUNE 4, 1964

OFFICIAL REPORTERS
ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.
BOARD OF TRADE BLDG.
11 ADELAIDE ST. W.
TORONTO

364-5865 364-7383

ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.
TORONTO, ONTARIO

ROYAL COMMISSION ON METROPOLITAN TORONTO

Hearings of the Royal Commission on Metropolitan Toronto, held at the Parliament Buildings, Toronto, Ontario, on Thursday, June 4, 1964, commencing at 10:00 A.M. et seq.

PRESENT:

H. CARL GOLDENBERG, O.B.E., Q.C. - Commissioner

F.H. FINNIS - Secretary

L. FELDMAN - Research Officer

T. PLUNKETT - Municipal Consultant

ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.
TORONTO, ONTARIO

INDEX TO SUBMISSIONS

DESCRIPTION	PAGES
THE HYDRO-ELECTRIC COMMISSION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ETOBICOKE	1452 - 1457
THE METROPOLITAN TORONTO EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL	1458 - 1464
THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CANADA	1465 - 1470

* * * * *

un 4/64
/EMT/je

THE COMMISSIONER: Etobicoke Hydro Electric Commission. Will you come forward?

SUBMISSION OF THE

HYDRO-ELECTRIC COMMISSION OF THE

TOWNSHIP OF ETOBICOKE

MR. V.S. WILSON - Chairman

MR. CLARKE WARDLAW - Vice-Chairman

MR. J.P. MAC BETH - Reeve

MR. JOHN IRWIN - Secretary-Treasurer

MR. JOHN TORRANCE - Chief Engineer

THE COMMISSIONER: Are you Mr. Wilson?

MR. WILSON: Yes, sir. I am Chairman for the Etobicoke Commission. I have with me, sir, Mr. Clarke Wardlaw, the Vice-Chairman, Mr. John MacBeth, Reeve of Etobicoke Township, Mr. John Irwin, our Secretary-Treasurer, and Mr. John Torrance, our Chief Engineer.

Mr. Commissioner and Gentlemen, I have very little to add to our submission. These days a great deal is heard about savings which could be effected by amalgamation. When a comparison of Metro hydro rates and costs were examined by our Commissioners, it was very evident that these would not apply, and we felt this information would be useful in this study of this area.

I might mention that the 1962 figures are used because Ontario Hydro has not yet issued their report for 1963. However, the relationship of these

costs do not change to any great extent from year to year.

I think the final paragraph in our submission sums up the feeling of our Commission. This is a very simple presentation. However, if you have any questions we will endeavour to have them answered or obtain the information and forward same to you. This is the presentation from the Hydro-Electric Commission for the Township of Etobicoke.

THE COMMISSIONER: From reading your brief it is clear that you feel that continuation of individual hydro distribution commissions in all the municipalities, or at least as far as Etobicoke is concerned, is advisable and desirable.

MR. WILSON: We are very happy, sir, with the present situation. There have been many suggestions, but I do not think probably it is fair on my part to refer to what suggestions have been made for division of municipalities.

THE COMMISSIONER: When I look at the situation and see on the one hand the control exercised by the Ontario Hydro Commission to which you refer, and the fact that all you are engaged in is supplying a distribution system, I wonder whether a separate and distinct elected commission is necessary in each municipality. I am not convinced that it is. I would be glad if you would add anything to clarify your position.

MR. WILSON: Well,sir, I might say that I have been a Commissioner for the past twenty-eight years in Etobicoke. I have been past president of Ontario

Municipal Electric Association which covers the province. I have knowledge I think of what transpires in many municipalities across the province as well as in Metro, and I feel in Etobicoke we have a situation there which is equal to or better than most municipalities across the province. We have developed in the most modern way possible, and I think we are most happy to continue to operate as we are.

THE COMMISSIONER: How would Etobicoke be affected if there were one commission, a Metropolitan Commission, in charge of the distribution of electricity? How would Etobicoke suffer?

MR. WILSON: I think in our comparison here on the back of the last page of our submission, sir, that if that were checked, Etobicoke is rendering a service to the Township there financial-wise that is not available in some of these other municipalities.

THE COMMISSIONER: You mean because your rates are lower than some of the other rates?

MR. WILSON: No, the average cost of power per kilowatt I think faces up to the fact that we have a very good administration there, and when you look at system maintenance in the first column there, there is quite a variety of figures and costs.

THE COMMISSIONER: The differentials there I admit interest me.

MR. WILSON: Pardon?

THE COMMISSIONER: I was interested in the differentials which I saw, but I was wondering if electric distribution in an area like this is really a

function which should be left to each of the local municipalities.

MR. WILSON: Well, we are most happy with the situation in Etobicoke. We also serve the municipality of Long Branch, and have since their segregation from the Township in 1931.

THE COMMISSIONER: Well, hasn't Long Branch its own distribution system?

MR. WILSON: It has its own distribution system, sir, but we operate it.

THE COMMISSIONER: I see.

MR. WILSON: There are only two other areas west of the Humber, Mimico and New Toronto, that have segregated from the Township previous to Long Branch, and they have their own distribution system and their own Commissions. For the past thirty-odd years since Long Branch segregated we have operated the Long Branch system.

THE COMMISSIONER: Apart from the Reeve, the other two commissioners are elected every two years?

MR. WILSON: That is right, sir.

THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I understand the position you have taken.

MR. WILSON: That is fine.

THE COMMISSIONER: I will certainly give it due consideration.

MR.WILSON: I might say we have gone for automation as it says in our brief in controls and office routine, and I guess we were the first municipality in the province to adopt that principle, and it

has paid off exceedingly well, I think.

THE COMMISSIONER: Some of the others in the Metropolitan area have not gone that far?

MR. WILSON: Oh, very few of them have, if any.

THE COMMISSIONER: Some of them would be too small?

MR. WILSON: Some of them would, that is right. We put it in as we grew,and developed it as our population and customers increased. That is one of the reasons why we enjoy the situation in our municipality hydro-wise as we do.

THE COMMISSIONER: You want to continue enjoying it?

MR. WILSON: We would be very happy, sir, to continue. I don't suppose there is any necessity to read this brief. I would be glad to if you would like me to.

THE COMMISSIONER: I have read it. If it would satisfy you more I would let you read it.

MR. WILSON: No. It is very simple. I might just read the last paragraph, sir. I think it states the feeling of our Commission. It is the opinion of this Commission that the people will benefit both in service and efficiency when citizens of the community are entrusted with the governing and supply of the central public services to their own community, and that amalgamation of hydro utilities in Metropolitan Toronto would result in increased costs with no improvement in service, and the removal of elected

representatives, far beyond the reach of the ordinary citizen.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much, Mr. Wilson.

MR. WILSON: Thank you, sir.

THE COMMISSIONER: Is Metropolitan Toronto Educational Research Council represented?

SUBMISSION OF THE

METROPOLITAN TORONTO EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

COUNCIL

MR. A. TURNER - Vice-President

MR. GRANT GILLESPIE - Secretary-Treasurer

THE COMMISSIONER: Are you Mr. Jackson?

MR. TURNER: No, unfortunately Dr. Jackson is unable to be here this morning. I am Alec Turner, Vice-President of the Council, and I have with me Mr. Grant Gillespie, who is Secretary-Treasurer of the Council.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: May I ask you at the outset is the Council an official body or unofficial organisation?

MR. TURNER: We are incorporated now, Mr. Commissioner, and this actually has happened in order that we can manage our financial affairs simply because we did not have any other way of doing this or managing them. So to this extent the organisation is an independent body.

However, we exist, if you like, with the blessing of the various Boards of Education which constitute Metropolitan Toronto. Those who are members of the Council are employees of the various Boards of Education. For example, I am an Inspector in Etobicoke; Mr. Gillespie is Superintendent of Schools in the

Lakeshore. The Council consists of individuals and people such as ourselves. Not every Board in Metropolitan Toronto has a research facility or research function. Those which have, their research officers are members of the Council.

THE COMMISSIONER: I see. Well, you have answered my question. You are not officially sponsored by the Boards of Education?

MR. TURNER: No, not as such, although each Board contributes financially to the support of the organisation, and in turn our reports are submitted to the various Boards of Education. To this extent I would guess that we have their approval. Otherwise they wouldn't support us.

THE COMMISSIONER: I do not want to anticipate what you are going to say in presenting your brief, but it has been suggested to me by different bodies that educational research should be centralized in the Metropolitan Board or some centralized Board. How would you fit into that picture, or would that affect you or your Council in any way?

MR. TURNER: Mr. Commissioner, in trying to answer your question, there are several parts to this, and if I may now add I have pointed out in our brief that basically there are two kinds of research; one which is associated with accounting, administration, whereas the programme of our Council is devoted to what we would like to think of as educational research. If I may make this distinction.

Now, our concern in this that a centralized

body might tend to be concerned with the functions that are associated with school planning, finance, those sorts of things, school enrolment, boundaries, population growth and so on. The Metropolitan School Board does have a department now which does work on these problems. We are not opposed to a centralized organisation. We are concerned I think that research remain close to the educational programme as it exists in the classrooms each day.

If there was one criticism that might be made of educational research in the past I think it might rest on this point, that there has been too great a distance between what has been happening to the children and research people.

One of the hopes I think we have in our Council is that we can perhaps overcome this problem, so I think our point of view is simply that we want to help if we can to sustain research at a local level. Now, there would be research undertakings related to such things as cognition and learning theories which local boards such as Etobicoke would find it very difficult to support from the financial point of view. Therefore, undertakings of this kind certainly would benefit from the financial support that could be sustained through a centralized budget, if you like,

I hope I am being clear about this, Mr. Commissioner. I think our concern as far as research is concerned is that the perspective we are trying to develop in association with research work is an important consideration in view of the total development

of the school system within Metropolitan Toronto, and therefore we see both elements, if you like, as being essential to this function.

THE COMMISSIONER: I just asked those questions because I was not clear as to how you fitted into the over-all system.

MR. TURNER: We sometimes wonder about this ourselves, Mr. Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Now you may proceed with your brief. If you want to read it, it is just two pages.

MR. TURNER: Well, Mr. Commissioner, I feel I would be quite content to try to answer any questions as best I may. I do not think I want to add anything particularly to what we have submitted to you for your consideration. Perhaps I might make one point: that the Council is beginning to experience certain difficulties in terms of its support of and interest in various research activities. These relate generally to a sufficient budget to support them. The second problem associated with this is that we, all of us, sort of so to speak have full-time work, more than we can do in our own particular position.

Therefore, for two reasons, personnel and finances, I think there are certain limitations in terms of what our organisation can continue to do. We do feel that we are making reasonable progress, but nonetheless, we are going to encounter problems of this kind in the not too distant future.

THE COMMISSIONER: Would you read the last

two paragraphs?

MR. TURNER: Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Which tie in what you want with my own terms of reference.

MR. TURNER: Did you want me to read those and comment as I go?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, if you would, please.

MR. TURNER: Believing that research is a vital part of a viable educational system, the Metropolitan Toronto Educational Research Council wishes to bring to the attention of the Goldenberg Commission certain functions of educational research which should be considered in the Commission's recommendations. For maximum effectiveness certain kinds of research should be done by classroom teachers who are personally involved in the planning of the study, the collection of the data and the implementation of the results. The services of professional researchers should be available to give advice and encouragement to school personnel undertaking such studies. As this kind of research is basically a practical attempt to solve an existing problem, the outcome is most likely to be of maximum benefit to the class or school in which the research was conducted. It is not sufficient to have a highly-centralized research organization in which problems are investigated and the findings handed down in the form of orders to be implemented by the teachers without any involvement or real understanding on their part.

I daresay we are a little afraid of the research becoming an ivory tower approach to educational

problems. We are trying to seek a reasonable plan I think between these two kinds of functions.

However, it is recognized by the Metropolitan Toronto Educational Research Council that certain other kinds of educational research can only be carried out by a central agency. Examples are the planning of school facilities, administrative research, and basic investigations as to the nature of the learning process.

It is the belief of the Metropolitan Toronto Educational Research Council that the most effective contribution of educational researchers to the improvement of education in the schools of Metropolitan Toronto can be made under an organization which encourages both local and centralized educational research activities. It is important that the channels of communication be kept open and co-operation in research activities encouraged, so that professional research workers and classroom teachers can make the maximum use of their knowledge and experience.

THE COMMISSIONER: What do you mean by a central agency? Do you mean an agency within the Central School Board?

MR. TURNER: This is a pretty difficult question, Mr. Commissioner. I hope I am transmitting the motiviation of my colleagues or their own opinions on this. Our present feeling is that the Research Council as it presently exists fulfills its function to a limited degree; that if it did have the support and the identity to develop and carry out research on a Metro-wide basis, this could be fruitful because at the present

time, for example, I know of one suburban Board of Education which is doing pretty much the same sort of thing in test construction as we are. This is a duplication of effort.

If there was a co-ordinating agency which would bring these two efforts together so that the results would accrue benefits to both Boards, this would seem to us to be a reasonable approach to this. I suppose one of our hopes is that we can initiate and sustain a co-operative approach to research problems as far as education is concerned within the Metropolitan area.

The exact definition of a central agency -- we would be prepared to suggest what this might be, but I am a little at a loss to define this adequately for you now.

The statement at the bottom of the second page: It is the belief of the Metropolitan Toronto Educational Research Council that the most effective contribution of educational researchers to the improvement of education in the schools of Metropolitan Toronto can be made under an organization which encourages both local and centralized educational research activities. It is important that the channels of communication be kept open and co-operation in research activities encouraged, so that professional research workers and classroom teachers can make the maximum use of their knowledge and experience.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much.

THE COMMISSIONER: The Communist Party of Canada. Are you Mrs. Phyllis Clarke?

SUBMISSION OF THE

COMMUNIST PARTY OF CANADA

MRS. PHYLLIS CLARKE - Chairman

MRS. CLARKE: What would you prefer, Mr. Commissioner, that I answer questions?

THE COMMISSIONER: If you want to highlight your brief I would put questions to you as you go along. I have read it. I do not think it necessary for you to read the whole of it, but you can go through it.

MRS. CLARKE: Well, there are essentially two points which we feel are important in relation to Metro Toronto. One is that we feel that an amalgamation of the thirteen municipalities, provided that two features are part of that amalgamation, would be of benefit to the people in this area.

Now, the first feature being a change in relation to Provincial as opposed to Municipal responsibilities on certain financial questions such as the question of education, health and welfare services. Also the need of the Provincial Government we feel to bring the services in all the thirteen municipalities up to the level of the highest, whatever it is in each case, and that they should assume the full cost for this if amalgamation is brought into the Metropolitan area.

The second question that we are particularly

concerned with is the need to have a more democratic system of government in Metro Toronto than the Metro system affords. The fact that we have a Metro Council which is not elected directly by the citizens of this City, the Chairman of which is either elected by the Council itself or appointed, we feel is an undemocratic feature of municipal government, and that amalgamation to be in the interests of the people in this area must include election of all representatives on whatever body would be city council or whatever one would call it at that point of the amalgamated area.

We also feel that there needs to be an extension of democracy with a proposition that there be Ward or local Municipal Councils maintained to deal with certain questions that would be prescribed in law, such as sidewalk and street repairs, zoning by-laws, maintenance, local parks. They would have a fixed budget. That would give a local government at the same time as you would have an amalgamated city that would be close to the people on the questions.

We feel that the municipal franchise should be expended to all those who are 18 years and over throughout Metro Toronto.

I think the status of our propositions is that amalgamation, unless it includes the basic principles of democracy and tax propositions which would ease the burden of taxation on the home owner and the small businessman in this Metropolitan area, is not necessarily a step ahead but could even be a step backward and we don't think amalgamation without any qualifications is a particular benefit. We do think the Metro set-up as such has in its democratic aspects serious weaknesses. Certainly there is the fact that taxes have increasingly gone up in this area since the Metro set-up was brought in and the provincial share of costs in this area has been reduced as a result of the Metro set-up.

THE COMMISSIONER: When you talk about taxes having risen under the Metropolitan set-up, are you suggesting that nothing was done to warrant an

increase in taxation in the post-war years?

MRS. CLARK: I would not suggest that at all. We are concerned not about absolutes but the relative question of the provincial share in this Metropolitan area. For example, as we pointed out in the brief, since 1954 the provincial share of capital costs on elementary schools would be from 37% to 18%. We feel the Metro set-up made possible a decrease in provincial grants to this Metro area and our contention is education, welfare, and health costs should not become, or should not remain as they are at the present time, within the purview of municipalities, Toronto or any other municipality.

We feel that these are questions which both the senior governments, federal and provincial, should assume full responsibility for and that taxes went up in this City to take care of things that are essentially not municipal questions.

THE COMMISSIONER: You say in your brief that the problems which must be resolved by amalgamation are mainly the result of industrial and commercial growth. This is on page 3 in the third paragraph. Is it not rather the residential growth resulting from the population explosion in the post-war years that has created the problems?

MRS. CLARK: Well, it seems to me which comes first the chicken or the egg? The population in Toronto has increased because of the increase in industry in this area which has brought workers to it from not only all over Canada but all over

ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.
TORONTO, ONTARIO

the world, which has certainly resulted in a population growth which has affected residential as well as industrial growth. I don't think the people just came here without the fact that industry was expanding in this City.

THE COMMISSIONER: Of course, on the question of taxation, taxation as such is really not the primary matter within my terms of reference. There is an Ontario Committee on Taxation sitting on that subject.

MRS. CLARK: I appreciate that.

THE COMMISSIONER: I have one other point. You recommend amalgamation and at the same time you recommend that each municipality or Ward should elect a Municipal or Ward Council which would have authority over local matters. Well, you are not really recommending amalgamation in the complete sense of the term, are you?

MRS. CLARK: Well, I think there is a difference, if I may suggest, between the situation that we have at present where there is a Metro Council that is made up of representatives from the local bodies and the election of an overall City Council and a simultaneous election in local areas of local Councils who would be subordinate to the overall City Council and who would receive the finances from the overall City Council. It is not really a duplication in the sense that we have two levels of government today. Their responsibility would be set out by the City Council. It is a bit hard talking about Councils

not yet established, to figure a good term for them.

The thought in this was to have a local body that was a bit closer to the people than a City Council that would represent the whole of this very large Metro area. When such questions as sidewalk repairs or a traffic light would come up, you would have to go to a City Council that would represent the whole area and that could get very easily lost. I don't know many cities in the world who have this system but I think there are some where there are local bodies who are subordinate to the central body and are set up primarily as a place where the residents within one area can come and make representation and have a body which is closer to them.

THE COMMISSIONER: You want an elected body to do the work which otherwise would be done by a branch of a central office of the big City?

MRS. CLARK: I suppose that would, to some extent, explain it. I think we need a body which is a bit closer to the people.

THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I think I know what you have in mind. Thank you very much.

This is a short morning. I am now adjourning until Tuesday next at 10:00 A.M. The first brief to be presented is by Comptroller Allan Lamport.

---THE HEARING WAS THEN ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 A.M. ON JUNE 9, 1964.

ROYAL COMMISSION

ON

METROPOLITAN TORONTO

HEARINGS

HELD AT

PARLIAMENT BLDGS.
TORONTO

VOLUME No.: 17

DATE: JUNE 9, 1964

OFFICIAL REPORTERS
ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.
BOARD OF TRADE BLDG.
11 ADELAIDE ST. W.
TORONTO

364-5865 364-7383

ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.
TORONTO, ONTARIO

ROYAL COMMISSION ON METROPOLITAN TORONTO

Hearings of the Royal Commission on Metropolitan Toronto, held at the Parliament Buildings, Toronto, Ontario, on Tuesday, the 9th day of June, 1964 commencing at 10:00 A.M. et seq.

PRESENT:

H. CARL GOLDENBERG, O.B.E., Q.C.	- Commissioner
F.H. FINNIS	- Secretary
L. FELDMAN	- Research Officer
T. PLUNKETT	- Municipal Consultant

ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.
TORONTO, ONTARIO

INDEX TO SUBMISSIONS

DESCRIPTION	PAGES
ALLAN A. LAMPORT	1473 - 1519
COMPTROLLER WILLIAM L. ARCHER	1520 - 1552
REEVE TRUE DAVIDSON, TOWNSHIP OF EAST YORK	1553 - 1582
MRS. FLORENCE GELL, DEPUTY REEVE OF THE TOWNSHIP OF YORK	1583 - 1591
MR. E. H. FARROW	1592 - 1600

* * * * *

THE COMMISSIONER: Controller Allan Lamport.

SUBMISSION OF

CONTROLLER ALLAN A LAMPORT

MR. LAMPORT: Good morning, sir.

THE COMMISSIONER: Are you prepared to proceed?

MR. LAMPORT: If I may, please, sir. Mr. Commissioner, I have forwarded for your attention on the suggestion of Mr. Finnis of your staff a proper number of briefs originally, and I forwarded to you yesterday the first copy we took off on the addendum and other added material, and have left others with Mr. Finnis this morning.

THE COMMISSIONER: I just want you to know, Mr. Lamport, that I have read your suggestion, and that when I arrived last night the addendum to your submission was waiting for me, and I read it until a fairly late hour so that I am familiar with what you are saying.

MR. LAMPORT: You are very kind, sir. Mr. Commissioner, annexed to the table of contents there are brief notes there, and I will try and be brief. I think I have enough time to include what is required for one who, as I have said, works in a factory.

Dr. Goldenberg, I hope I have taken a different approach in developing the facts for your information. I have tried to avoid the scientific type of brief and have tried hard to give you the cold,

unadulterated facts as I have found them and I believe with experience know their effects. It is nice to think that I have had the good fortune to be spared since 1951 when I appeared before your predecessor on a similar question, Mr. Lorne Cumming I believe it was, in May 1951, and I appeared as an independent in that case as I do appear here.

While our counsel has submitted a brief, I have had no restrictions put on me either with your kindness or that of my counsel, and this I submit is important.

It is evident, Mr. Commissioner, and I think it is important to read perhaps one item from my first brief rather than troubling you with that. You very kindly stated you read it, and that is a help to me and I appreciate it, but I would like you to look at page 2 known as "Background" in my first brief, and starting down in the second paragraph, starting with the "I", I would like to read these important words: I must say emphatically that the feeling of those who were involved at the very beginning was that amalgamation would be the eventual and desirable result of the Metropolitan system of Government. To illustrate, I quote the words of the Honourable Leslie M. Frost, who, speaking to the Ottawa members of the Ontario Legislature on February 25, 1953, -- and I was Mayor, and this was after the report was down and this was now Bill 80 -- his words were as you see there, and I would like to read them:

"Among those favouring total

amalgamation there are a substantial number who argue that it should be effected over a period of time. Those who favour total amalgamation, therefore, will find nothing in this legislation to prevent gradual and total amalgamation if that is desirable."

Mr. Frost was Prime Minister of Ontario at that time, and it was his words which persuaded me, even though I had to vote alone in my own Council, and it is difficult as Mayor to have to do that sometimes, to take the first and necessary step into that extreme cold water towards what I conclude and what Mr. Frost and unquestionably others felt would be total amalgamtion eventually. Such a step was calculated to provide the suburban municipalities with the necessary credit to enable development. I submit, with respect, that the credit has been used and, therefore, Metro's purpose has been achieved because, as I point out, Mr. Commissioner, there were very few of these municipalities a few years before that that had not defaulted on their bonds, Toronto being one of them, and the credit of the area municipalities was at as low as possible ebb, and the re-financing was on the basis of a half to three-quarters of one percent of interest. You will readily understand what a bad shape they were in when the interest rates generally were ranging from 5 to 6 percent at that time in Toronto.

Now, I would like to get back to the first page of my comments. It is evident, Mr. Commissioner, from all these briefs that have been submitted and many

I have heard or read of and have heard in Metro Council, that the majority wanted change. They have varied in many ways in that change, the same people, in six months. For instance, it was hard at one time to get sufficient votes in Metro Council to favour amalgamation because those favouring the Metro form of government stuck together for the Metro form, but those are not the briefs they presented here, Mr. Commissioner. They have varied, the ones who spoke strongly, have varied even from the chairman down.

I might point out there will be some tables in my brief . . . the same as Mr. Hardy's. I put them in because I thought it would save time of your Commission, sir, to have them available here for reference.

Metro had a temporary useful purpose whose time was extended improperly, too long. Therefore, difficulty set in, and when little empires are built up they are hard to break down.

Amalgamation is uniformity which brings higher standards. This area cannot continue to go on as it is avoiding the clash that always come with new steps.

Duplication of committees, commissions, etcetera, are wasteful in dollars and time, particularly when we have not enough to do the things properly in the system that should be done. Duplication is a luxury that we cannot afford, and I point out, Mr. Commissioner, down through the common grounds of its operation here we have a report of the executive committee in Metro. It deals with all the things, and

the committees and Boards, that the same report would deal with from the Board of Control in Toronto. So we have one report that is a few hundred yards away in another council chamber from the Board of Control report of Toronto, both dealing, both laid out the same way, but two separate reports dealing with the same matters that certainly could have been combined and should have been combined for accessible and understanding purposes that are not available to the general public to know which place they should go and see who is doing the business that is requiring their attention and is affecting their future. Now, it is ridiculous to have that. The Parks Committee Report -- and the same applies with budgets -- in every case we sit hours and hours on a budget for Metro and hours and hours on a budget for Toronto, dealing with the same things.

Now, some say there will be increasing costs. Yes, on one hand there may be because there will be higher standards, and the highest standards will be attained by all, not the lowest, so this may probably increase some costs, but that is exactly what we are seeking surely in our lives today. An improvement in standards. In the end, even with the improvement of standards, there will be a saving to those of us in the highest mill rate category, and no increase in standards will have to be paid for insofar as the Toronto taxpayers are concerned because they have always sought that as should all municipalities within the area.

That is why I recommend it, and why those who work in the factory can see mistakes without it.

THE COMMISSIONER: Excuse me, Mr. Lamport, did you say that the Toronto taxpayer will not pay a higher rate because he already has the highest standards?

MR. LAMPORT: That is what I said, sir.

THE COMMISSIONER: Well, if you have amalgamation, do you propose different rates for the areas?

MR. LAMPORT: No. I propose there should only be the same assessment available to all. I think as I have understood the plan that has been mentioned by all clearly that that will bring and should bring under the then elected government a uniform tax rate so that whether it be a home here in Toronto or a home in North York or Scarborough, their rate on the assessed dollar will be the same. Not a variation as we have today of some thirteen.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. I just want to --

MR. LAMPORT: Please ask me.

THE COMMISSIONER: I wanted to get this clearly in my mind.

MR. LAMPORT: Of course.

THE COMMISSIONER: I understood you to say that amalgamation will mean an improvement in standards.

MR. LAMPORT: It will in the other municipalities, but Toronto.

THE COMMISSIONER: That is right. What you say here is that there will be higher standards, and the highest standard will be attained by all, not the lowest standard. Then as I understand, you went on to say

Toronto already having the highest standards will not have to pay a higher rate. Now, you don't mean if there is a higher rate than the present Toronto rate because it will be necessary to raise standards in the suburbs that Toronto will continue to pay a lower rate and the rate will be higher in the outside suburbs?

MR. LAMPORT: I see how I have confused you, sir. No, what I was trying perhaps to get too briefly to your attention was that Toronto with its higher standards there will be nothing in the over-all rate because Toronto is low that will have to be paid for to bring Toronto standards up. The increase that will probably have to be paid by Toronto will, of course, increase the standards of the others.

THE COMMISSIONER: Of the others, yes.

MR. LAMPORT: Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

MR. LAMPORT: Under the present form of Metro government the imbalance is becoming almost ridiculous. In 1953 in the suburban municipalities, the population was North York, 110,311, Scarborough, 78,303 and Etobicoke 70,206. At that time each had one vote in Metro Council. They still have one vote despite the tremendous population increase: North York now has 336,446, which has tripled; Scarborough, 230,338 which has more than tripled, and Etobicoke, 165,000 which is a little more than double. I am sorry, Scarborough has a little more than doubled and Etobicoke has a little more than doubled.

Including the Metro chairman, the number of

elected persons in Metro totals 109, just one more than the number it takes to govern the entire Province of Ontario. How ridiculous to say there is no duplication. I wonder? We have 124 executives in 124 departments in Metro and within thirteen municipalities. In addition, we have scores of deputy department heads which are not included in this total. In terms of clerks and other staff, we have 265 persons that the taxpayers pay a wage bill for of 1,500,000 a year for this alone -- not that we are looking foward as a lot of the fears are to those who say "Oh, we will keep the Metro form." They are fearing somebody will be fired. We have the same thing happening in Toronto as you have in other places, and of course there is a considerable turn-over annually, and that will mean a falling-off rather than discharging of people which it is normal to do in Government. This is not considered to be a demand for mass firing of any kind. It will just find its own level by the process of elimination through changing of jobs, positioning and so on.

THE COMMISSIONER: So that the savings which you envisage under amalgamation would not take place immediately?

MR. LAMPORT: Certainly.

THE COMMISSIONER: It would take place over a period of time?

MR. LAMPORT: The process of time. I would think if it were started -- that is why I feel it should be started -- I would think the real effect of it would not be felt for five or six years. It could very well

be. I think the efficiency would be felt immediately insofar as actual physical work is concerned, but the financial and physical aspect collectively will not be felt for five or six years because of the slowly adjusting requirements of the staff.

We have created 102 local commissions and Boards, and we have manned them with 821 persons -- more persons than road into the valley of death in the famous Charge of the 600.

On that point, 102 commissions, I saw in the Press the other day, Mr. Commissioner, and I have made it a point over many years and have said so, I think perhaps one of the greatest and most ridiculous things is this combination of hydro Boards when I believe we have eleven in this area, and yet we have one Bell Telephone Company serving the whole area. We have one gas company serving the whole area , and we have one water works.

Now, even insofar as our political operation is concerned, we can do it with water, and we can do it with our Police force and all the others, but yet when we look for cumbersome things it usually happens we find it in politics. There is one place it can be eliminated very easily. I just point that out as one example -- it isn't as if there is much physical work in that to require staff; the hydro goes through wires as the telephone goes through wires and the gas through its pipes. It isn't as if you have to have bodies here and there to do it. And it is better to do it on a local basis perhaps as some might argue, but I notice

in the Press you had made some comment on it and I was drawing my comments to your attention.

I am sure, Dr. Goldenberg, you are not offended by the many debates that have taken place since you have been appointed as Commissioner to inquire into the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto government, or whatever government you should recommend. It would be trickery to suggest that you would be offended, and as some would say, "You must not discuss this.", and I want to point out I am one of the ones guilty, and I stand here to be charged or convicted or freed on this count that "Oh, you must not discuss this before the Royal Commission." Well, of course, I said at that time as I am sure you perhaps won't agree or take one side or the other, but I felt that it is trickery to suggest that you didn't want to know.

THE COMMISSIONER: I certainly am not offended by public discussion on a public matter in a democracy.

MR. LAMPORT: Thank you, sir. It is very encouraging to know that because those of us who have been in it as long as you and I have, have always felt that way. I explained to Council while the Commissioner is not a Judge I am sure Dr. Goldenberg would welcome as wide as possible discussion because he, as all big men, do not categorize themselves as without the need of some guidance from those of us who are elected and are responsible, Mr. Commissioner, for the results.

THE COMMISSIONER: You are perfectly right.

MR. LAMPORT: Thank you, sir. That is why

I am here. I think the matter of the question of amalgamation should be constantly before us and constantly considered, because in my opinion as one who works in a factory and has examined it, I feel I can be of some guidance in offering what recommendations I can give from my experience and practice.

You have heard from the School Board, Mr. Commissioner, particularly the City of Toronto in this connection, showing the imbalance and injustice without amalgamation, and shown in the records here, in the tables. You have certainly heard about the Library Board and how they wish to correct the injustice for the value and importance of the quest for learning through their services, which can only be just and equitable on an amalgamation basis.

The only people who benefit from the present Metro form of government are those members who actually sit in the Metropolitan Council. It is very clear that it was always intended, as you will find in the clippings attached to my addendum, which indicate it was the contention of all that the representatives of the people who formed the Metropolitan government should be elected and there should be no further delay in seeing that it is done directly.

It is not right to say they are elected now. At present in no way on the ballots is it indicated who will be their representatives in Metro dealing with the third largest budget in Canada for any province or municipality. Direct election will bring about a sounder distribution of representation which

is sadly out of balance, having regard for the three Lakeshore municipalities with small populations and the other three I have mentioned above, Mr. Commissioner, with populations increasing, and ours in Toronto.

I might just touch on an item, and other items have come since last night to me, and that is a matter of education, Mr. Commissioner, unconditional grants, and if it were amalgamated this would not happen. There would not be this ridiculous see-sawing with somebody having to check the balance of where it goes. There was one, I believe one vote that merited this enormous increase this year.

Here is where I think the crux of the injustice is, sir. We have in two or three of the municipalities bus systems because the local School Board, the local Home & School Club have said "Oh, I want my child to go to school." True, the highest assessed homes are not in Toronto; they are in the suburbs. They may feel they can demand it, but keep in mind we are paying that unconditional grant which provides the funds for all their other inequalities, including this. They have bus service on their own bus line. Goodness knows what the drivers do all day. They have to be members of the union which is right, I would think, but they have only driving to do in the morning, and in some cases at noon and of course in all cases at night, and the Toronto taxpayers are paying for that. The Toronto school children use shoe leather to walk the distances they have to, and if not, the parents pay out of their own personal pockets the transportation required, for

instance, to take them to high school. The high schools are a little more remote from homes than the public schools because there are a few around. And the technical schools, in the same way, in this City. They have to pay for that. Therefore I think there is something to be said for all of these -- they don't appear too large, but we are loaded with so many that these are just some of the items that I want to draw to your attention. It is nice to have them have the buses. That is not the point. We can't afford it in Toronto because we don't get money from them to help us meet our problems. We have to cough up the money that permits them to meet theirs.

THE COMMISSIONER: Are you suggesting, then, Mr. Lamport that under amalgamation you would stop the system of transportation to schools in the outer parts of the amalgamated city?

MR. LAMPORT: Let me tell you what we would do. I would suggest I know a little bit about transportation too. The principle in this province is that the province will pay, Mr. Commissioner, 15 to 95 percent of the cost of transporting children to school in the areas other than an area of this size. They do in some cities on the edges, and they pay for the local school department. If that is the case then it would be my suggestion, and the suggestion would be workable, but under the present form it is not; however, I would suggest we then look into the transportation situation for all of the students, not just for two or three area municipalities.

It may be we would say, well, here where you have a good transit system, the school board will pay as they have entered into the field of paying for their lunches or giving a deficit cafeteria, a cafeteria which carries a deficit for the people who can't afford the full cost of the meal. These are the things you would enter into, but you wouldn't have one municipality entirely on its own governing its own affairs and a bus line which could be a lot more expensive than if it were amalgamated. I know in some cases the bus line does not serve distances you should need for service to a school, but it happened they are going on the way to someplace else, so you can't say "No" to these children waiting. It gets almost ridiculous if it is operated on a two-municipality basis.

I think an over-all plan would be acceptable. I am sure it would, where we require it. We have to pick up those children who can't walk in this City. We do have a bus, but the School Board pays the cost of the bus to the transit system, who are experienced in that business. Here you have stand-by drivers that can take children to school, and yet you have drivers specifically for school buses up there. Surely this would be much better to get under transportation management, and have transportation management look after these buses instead of them sitting out there all summer long for three months doing absolutely nothing, because they can't be in competition with the transit system.

The further you examine it, you can see how the injustices are occurring; costs that Toronto

taxpayers are bearing for the want of some enterprise. Thank you.

One call that has always been on Toronto's back is that of the hospitalization that Toronto has had to bear. Toronto, Mr. Commissioner, has been carrying the hospital load for this area for all these years, and while one is shown in East York, The East Toronto General Hospital, it is credited to East York on the hospital bed account that is kept by the Ontario Hospital Services Commission. They say you should have five beds per thousand.

Toronto, Mr. Commissioner, has ten beds per thousand but other area municipalities have a somewhat lower amount, one per thousand. That is even an improvement.

Mr. Commissioner, I draw to your attention, and I will discuss the Table with you in a moment, that Toronto is carrying all these hospitals tax free and providing the police and fire services, all the services everybody else has, but the hospitals themselves that have been carrying this load of demand are not charging in the cost of the hospitals to the area municipalities all those services that we have been providing. Surely that should be spread over the area. Surely health you don't kick out the door because there is a balance in Council to pay the big bills. They won't take that plunge. They could always raise a doubt, I guess, because other members of the Council plead with them. That makes the position the more difficult. We have a lesser opportunity to insist on justice being done with the taxpayers' dollars of Toronto.

Now the latest call is the call of the Arts. You will notice this here recently in the Press and I say these are new things. The original Arts Foundation cost as recommended and as itemized by the Planning Board of Ontario was 32 million dollars. Now it has been watered down to 17 million dollars and yet Metro refuses to take any part of the cost. In the examination by this firm that did the examination work they pointed out that all the people are going to use it and they

referred to the areas and they broke it down in areas but not one copper is given.

Now, Mr. Commissioner, I claim at the present time we cannot afford it and there are other things we need more. Therefore we should not spend money on it. Surely under these circumstances, Mr. Commissioner, it would be reasonable to expect that if we had amalgamation -- you don't have it to meet the Arts but all these things work out much more easily and effectively and there is less load on those that have to carry the things that will be tax free. It is tax free and a deficit. These are the things of concern.

An immediate imbalance is government assistance offered for the Centennial grants, where they now all want to go on their own. There are Centennial funds provided by the Provincial and Federal Governments if the Municipality will spend one of their dollars. It was brought up with the Metropolitan Council but you cannot overcome that parochial attitude. They all want to have a Centennial project. I don't think I need to say any more about how ridiculous such a thing is. With the provision of Provincial and Federal Government assistance if we all got together we could have something worth while. The smaller municipality will build some minor thing because their dollar per capita and the other two dollars are very small because of their population. The small municipalities and the big ones are having to spend the taxpayers' money for thirteen different things instead of one project that would be stimulating for the Canadian Centennial.

Another matter is the fire boat. While this is before Metro, they have carefully said no, and yet you will note from my comments in other parts of this brief that the Toronto Harbour serves the shipping through the Toronto Harbour, from Metro and the rest of the Province, much more than it does for the City. You will notice, and I will point out later, Mr. Commissioner, that a small percentage is used by the Toronto taxpayers and there is an enormous tax free amount and yet the fire boat that was considered to be worthwhile for the shipping will not be shared by the Metropolitan area whose goods have to come across the docks of the City of Toronto provided for them and yet they won't pay one nickel for the harbour and all these things, particularly the over $100,000.00 annual cost of the fire boat.

These are some of the shining examples. They say: "You go ahead. You are not going to stop our shipping anyway."

The next is the City of Toronto swimming pools. You will see in the records how we have assessed it. There are swimming pools, hockey rinks, libraries and life saving services. There are very expensive open and closed ice rinks. Those are a few of the services we provide for the whole area and the cost is borne by the Toronto taxpayers alone.

You will find also on page 3 losses of taxes through tax free properties that Toronto bears the brunt on but Metro uses, such as the CNE, the hospitals, the University of Toronto, the libraries, the

ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.
TORONTO, ONTARIO

Toronto Harbour Commission, and the enormous increase in our water costs (page 22), which always had a million or more dollars' surplus, at less than half the gallonage cost to our taxpayers today.

Life saving service for the whole waterfront is supplied by Toronto at an estimated cost of $335,000.00 for 1964. That saves any life on the waterfront of Metropolitan Toronto. The last two who were saved were from Etobicoke. Toronto has the harbour, although there is a harbour at Pickering and a harbour at Port Credit, a very small and inefficient operation. The Yacht Clubs are here, the R.C.Y.C. and the National. They require that but their membership comes from all over Metro; more particularly Metro than anyplace else because those are the people that seem to like to take part and they can afford it. These are things that Toronto provides. They provide the life saving service and we cannot get a copper from them. They will go anyplace in the Metro area that they are called. You cannot choose boundary lines when coming to fire and life saving services.

Ambulance service is another thing that Toronto has the advantage of and supplies service to all of those who come in here daily from area municipalities. We were told by our Doctor who handles it that they get many, many calls for ambulance services over the border and he believes, he cannot give me the figures, he believes there are more ambulance service calls for the area municipalities. This is because they don't have the services per capita

we do or spend the money on them.

Now we do have an influx of people here for business and while we are thankful for it to a degree it is of little value if they are not carrying some of the costs of the roads and other functions which makes it worthwhile and one that can be calculated in the only way we know of, a dollars and cents basis of taxation.

Page 20 deals with the imbalance of area municipalities. All but three get from the government a contribution of 80% on bridges and 50% on road grants for maintenance and construction and cleaning, as does Metro for its roads and road cleaning no matter what municipality it may go through. Toronto has to get by on one-third or 33-1/3% and yet our roads are used more by everyone else than we use theirs, and the greater share of the gas tax comes from the congested areas. The table will indicate the terrible cost to us annually as well as since the inception of Metro. If it had stopped when it was intended we would all be on a 50% basis.

THE COMMISSIONER: In the main brief you say this applies to the City of Toronto and the Townships of York and East York. Has there been any attempt made at any time to change this?

MR. LAMPORT: Yes, sir. We have made a representation to the Province here and we made one a year ago last spring to the Prime Minister, which formed part of our brief. I haven't got it here but I can send you a copy of the brief. There have been all kinds of

references made to it in the general brief on taxation, sir.

On page 21 of this brief, I will show you that and I will go into it shortly. It will show you the enormous difference in this item.

The health standards of our Health Department are far in excess of any of the other area municipalities and the centre core is being kept in the highest possible health standards because of the enormous effort of this Department of the City of Toronto, which helps all those that come from the suburbs seeking work. I think it must be admitted they do come here and live in the dormitory municipalities because they want the finer homes and perhaps there is not room for them here. Because of the enormous efforts of the City of Toronto the health standards have improved. This is shown on page 18. I would urge you to read it. It is very, very convincing. There is this high standard of health services because the City of Toronto taxpayers paid 3 million dollars in 1964, which is exclusive of erecting and maintaining offices, etc.

THE COMMISSIONER: I have been told that this figure of 3 million dollars in 1964 is considerably less than what the figure was in 1953. Would that be correct?

MR. LAMPORT: Well, we were relieved of the inspection of the dairies, sir, and all the farms. We used to have that. That was taken over by Metro one year and now the Province has taken it over. We would doubt the total is less, but there are some items out

entirely and that was one of them. That was quite a large sum.

There are per capita grants paid to Metro from the Province and there is a condition attached under which Metro distributes them. It is a provincial condition which is an injustice to Toronto. Although we pay 42% of all costs of Metro services, we receive only 35% of the grants as they are based on residential assessment. You are familiar with that. This costs our residential taxpayers one million dollars a year since 1956 or a total of six million dollars.

Mr. Commissioner, this is a good time to point out that on a residential basis this compounds the situation because assessment in this area on residences will show you that apart from the partial exemption enjoyed in Toronto that was put on after the first War, apart from that residents in Toronto are assessed less as a result of their value and as a result of the people who are able to have the finer homes than in any part of the Metropolitan area, which would indicate the lower income people are living in Toronto. I think that is as close as you can get to any assessment on that fact.

The Metropolitan Island Park is situated in the heart of Toronto and as such we are responsible for the services, which costs are well over and above the revenue from taxation. The services that are supplied on this Island cost the taxpayers of the City of Toronto, not shareable by Metro, over and above

Toronto's share of the capital and current costs, $171,449.00 for 1964. This is, of course, yearly and this is shown on page 25.

Surely, Mr. Commissioner, with all the services that are required for a Metropolitan park, while it is a Metropolitan park and requires these services, there should be some adjustment to the taxpayers of Toronto who are also paying a share of the capital cost and they should not have to pay any loss. I will show you two or three others along this line in addition to that, which I will bring out to you insofar as Sunnybrook Hospital is concerned.

Public housing has failed badly in the Metro area and a shining example of a ridiculous operation is shown in Regent Park House, a Metro housing project, which pays the City of Toronto $25.00 per suite taxes. This creates an annual deficit of many thousands of dollars for the City of Toronto and in 1964 will be $86,000.00 short of what everybody has to pay. Yet that is a Metro operation and we pay the Metro half of that. Now this should not be.

Now I will ask you to turn to item 2 on Contents, where it points out what was intended and it shows on the clipping to the left. These were newspaper clippings in 1953 when Bill 80 was first sponsored. That indicated what the public were led to believe and led to expect and led to think would be done. I will just read this:

"The powers of individual municipalities to subsidize emergency housing projects and redevelopment

housing should be passed on to the Metropolitan Council."

Just recently has same been done. Alexander Park is one example.

"The report stated that in the past the suburban municipalities had been reluctant to make use of these powers and had contended at the Board hearing that any type of subsidized or publicly assisted housing should not be considered a proper function of municipal government."

We might all think that but that is what their contention was then. Even in spite of that they have continued, because of voting ability and power, in making plans for outward expansion of municipal services to meet the needs of urban expansion and the housing was expected to be taken care of in that way. Only just recently have they appointed a body.

I don't think Toronto was too smart in accepting this on this basis that Toronto was in need of trying to make the system work, the two or three systems, the partnership as well as the Federal Government original scheme. This particular one of Regent Park South has an annual deficit of $86,000.00.

I would now turn to page 6, getting to the end of these comments. In addition to that Toronto wrote down the land itself by nearly two million dollars. Our annual charges on this gift alone are $128,000.00. We went ahead with Regent Park East and West. That is now known as Regent Park North. These projects were gone ahead with by Toronto alone and assumed and the annual charges on the gift are $128,000.00 in 1963 and

for 30 years on which they are debentured until 1989 it will be $3,849,000.00 that Toronto taxpayers have to bear in addition to the $86,000.00 annual deficit. That is a state of affairs that cannot happen and won't happen if we are amalgamated.

THE COMMISSIONER: As an off-setting consideration on Regent Park South, Mr. Lamport, would not almost all the tenants be from the City of Toronto proper?

MR. LAMPORT: No. There were a number of people displaced in that area, and when I say "a number", it was very few in number. While there were small homes, there were a number of factories in there. I was the Mayor at the time when we bought the property and we bought it for housing similar to Regent Park North and got into the housing business but Metropolitan Toronto said: "We will get into it on this basis." I don't think Toronto examined it well enough or they would not be in that spot. That does not overcome the principle that you should not put a person in that spot who is anxious to get housing for the people.

Let us take your question the other way. There is a low assessment on homes and there are those people who can afford a certain rent and so they move into here and double up. With the older part of Toronto decaying and requiring rebuilding and construction, surely it is not reasonable that old Toronto, who has been used for all these kicking purposes and has made finances available to others because of more credit, that that should be taken away from it just because it is old.

Sir, the system has to be rebuilt. Are we going to suggest the area should remain as it is now because Toronto has so much of the oldness in it that has to be replaced and it should be replaced before Metro wants to take part in the livelihood and the future of the Metropolitan area. This is the parochial view of many and I submit this has to be considered in the light that Toronto is providing these services.

Toronto has a low assessment. These things have been gone into and I will try and stick to this. I know you want me to be as brief as possible. I have the figure, Mr. Commissioner, that you asked for. The Health Department costs in 1953 were actually $2,289,000.00. You mentioned ten years ago -- they are $3,000,000.00, as I said, today. There was some considerable amount taken off for the inspection of the dairies that we took on some years ago for the health of the City.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

MR. LAMPORT: Mr. Commissioner, a Youth Bureau is needed. It is important we enter into this. The Metropolitan Council has provided some six or seven thousand dollars, it may be more, and we put the Social Planning Council on to examine into this question. I do want to hit you with it. It is important that we enter into immediately the operation of another department so essential to the area and which could only work on an amalgamated basis. The children rove from one municipality to another. They are just

heedless and they only need help and guidance. There is nothing wrong with children that a grown-up is not to blame for, in my opinion. It is useless to go on as we are today with 13 municipalities trying to coordinate the youth effort. They have clubs, they have service clubs and try and coordinate some kind of effort in the municipalities. The recreational groups are small in some municipalities. They are numerous in Toronto and we accomplish absolutely nothing. The matter is getting worse, Mr. Commissioner. It is shameful. Some weeks there are more juveniles arrested than adults. It is for minor breaches but sufficient in the opinion of the police that it is necessary to bring them in. We fail badly without an amalgamated effort in this regard.

Youth needs attention and guidance and anything but amalgamation would be nothing more than continuing with experiments.

Each hour brings new matters to light. I bring to your attention the matter of police pensions of the former City of Toronto Police Department which was not taken over when Metro took over the Police Department, which of course should have been done. It is an injustice to Toronto as well as to the pensioners. It is not any different than any other outstanding debt of debentures or otherwise because everything should be considered on the same basis, not a variety of bases.

Metro in Bill 80 had discretion on how things were taken over. They took the whole ball of wax, the equipment and the debts. Everything should be

considered on the same basis, not a variety of bases that Metro has worked out its inequitable past.

The City pays $116,000.00 a year, Mr. Commissioner, and does until 1976. I haven't got that there, Mr. Commissioner. This figure I just got. If you would be good enough to have the Secretary put it on your books, it is $116,000.00 and this will be payable until 1976. They took over the police stations, all the vehicles, all the armament, all the clothing and everything. It was millions of dollars worth and yet they did not take over the human side of it.

Surely no one has to look twice at that to see how inequitable it is and what a wonderful police force they got for nothing.

The most glaring example before Metro and Toronto these days is shown on the last Exhibit which within the very last few days has come to light. I draw it to your attention to show how impossible it is in the Metropolitan form to ever get streamlined administration. I ask you to examine, after I finish the next paragraph, Exhibit 28.

/64
/je

It is an exhibit of a letter from the Commissioner of Buildings, dated May 29, 1964. It is addressed to me, re Metropolitan Separate School Board School Building -- it is addressed to me, Mr. Commissioner, because I indicated when I found the error to the Metropolitan Separate School Board building on the west side of Clinton Street, north of College Street, dealing with a permit which we issued at the time in the midst of the proposed alignment of the 400 Highway extension, and which is self-explanatory.

The last paragraph of the Commissioner's letter indicates this clearly where he says on page 2 of Item 28, Mr. Commissioner:

> "I might add that this Department has never had any plans of the proposed 400 Highway extension and I understand that the alignment of this extension has changed several times since it was laid out and indicated on a map in 1958."

Yet at Metro where I found it out, Toronto was chastised for issuing a permit because they ought to know where these things are going. That is where we are going around -- to use the words "Chicken with its head off" is minor league stuff alongside the cost of these things.

Yes, it may be able to sit there for a few years, but you know what we are going to pay for it; enormous sums to move it, and these people could have been served across the street if there had been proper co-ordination. Now, I don't complain that the staff of

the Commissions are not efficient. They are. We have some very capable men. Surprising if I tell you if many businesses had the capabilities of our Commissioners, Mr. Commissioner, they would have very little trouble, but you can't make things work if the machinery and gears are not put where they should be. The bare facts are too many managers or too many chiefs and not enough Indians. The taxpayers are paying the bill because we have far too much power without being elected to answer the questions.

If I might ask your secretary to add to this brief of mine, Mr. Commissioner, and it is shown on page 26, a suggestion of mine on the make-up of the election of those. I would be very negative if I complained about things not being done without offering some alternative, and I have always stated, Mr. Commissioner, and I think it is clearly identified if I might ask you again to turn to page 2 of the clippings. The clipping at the top from the Globe & Mail of January 22 -- there were two or three pages of this, Mr. Commissioner, and you would certainly be welcome to them, what the public have to read -- the only thing the public knew about this. "As soon as the system is in working order members would not be allowed to hold any other public office."

Then we will go to the next one at the top of the page, Mr. Commissioner, the Globe & Mail: "The Metropolitan Council will be a taxing authority and its members should therefore be elected, but, in the view of the Board, there are serious objections to any plan

for the direct election of the members who will constitute the first council."

They clearly identify what the people can expect. They had to have managers in order to say that these are the steps we should take. The managers were these appointed people who were elected in their municipalities, and I have said in the brief in no way does it indicate in any of the ballots, no matter what the imagination may be, the public do not do their thinking like that. They have no way of knowing who is going to be elected in the municipality that will go to Metro until that is explained, and if it is going to be explained, it should be put on the ballot.

On that same page you can read on, and if I might jump down to the next paragraph: "Moreover, the question whether the election of members should be an election at large or by wards or Metropolitan electoral divisions is one which would seem to require further study and consideration before a final decision is made. These were quotes from the then Commissioner, Lorne Cumming . A very capable man. He did a wonderful job on that.

Then I ask you to read the next one below that in another place, but these three were all the same day in one newspaper. They would certainly, I would think, indicate to you what the public sought and what the elected representatives who are appointed to this were not actually doing, and that nobody wanted to resign or retire, including the chairman in order that this thing should work the way it was intended because

appointments are originally for two years with an alternative by the Order-in-Council to extend it one year, and then it was by appointment of the Council. It would indicate clearly that all this was intended to be true, and then we go on to the second paragraph as shown there which says: "The report recognized the need for having the councillors elected.", and then the word "first" up there in the one before would indicate I think without any question or shadow of a doubt that it was intended because the hearing, Mr. Commissioner, if I may take you back, was on the basis that Toronto itself, the Planning Board of Toronto which Mr. Gardner was head of, it itself and many of the area municipalities thought amalgamation or annexation was the quite respectable and connected word in this at that time.

THE COMMISSIONER: They were more blatant than you are; is that right?

MR. LAMPORT: Well, frankly I said yes. You are quite right, I was not in at the time, Mr. Commissioner. I had been defeated for Mayor without a newspaper, and by 1,700 votes in a hundred and some thousand. However, I ran next year and was elected with 25,000 majority in one hundred and some thousand, so I feel even today the views that were taken at that time, I stood behind this government of the day and said "Yes , this is the only thing that can sensibly work," because I have to when I was responsible for the results in the position I was in and most looked at as a man who perhaps might desire amalgamation at that time.

I said it should be in steps, and steps would certainly be a Metropolitan form of government, and having all the words -- and this is not half of the words that have been published on it, but I am drawing the very important ones to your attention, people who sometimes don't support me, so I am not trying to just give the side of those who support me and therefore print something I might say because they want to support me -- that is possible too -- but I am pointing out people who have not supported me and give you the truth of those words which they try to tell to the public, as it is their responsibility to do.

So in trying to take you back, Mr. Commissioner, I would ask you to consider it on that basis.

The next is on page 26, Mr. Commissioner, the item on page 26 where I recommend how the elected representatives would work, or a suggestion on how they could be elected, and that it should be in segments like half a pie from the waterfront at the extreme west end, around the whole area to the extreme east end, and each segment would take in part of the business district so that knowledge required rather than dividing votes which you do where you get areas that are broken without any connection with the hub of the universe that you must keep lively, you have a tendency to vote against what is necessary for the sake of retaining your City, but it is human nature to protect. If segments take in part of the business district, the connection between residential and business districts would be one that would allow a man to have the feeling and pulse of both

without being parochial or just conditional on certain little things happening in an isolated area, because to isolate where there is a lot of farmland the one member would be affected by that, and you could see it would be unrealistic because he could, if there were a number of them, hold up a lot of worthwhile things because he didn't know. He might truthfully feel "I don't agree with this." because he doesn't know. He is not required to know his alderman; he is required to know his ward.

If the segment system were used, then you would be in a position to know what is required of transportation, fire, police. You get both concepts.

Now, we have people saying "There is none of the police out in my area.", and I can understand how they feel that way. They see a load downtown but they don't have to assist downtown, so therefore they like their viewpoint too, and they are not required to know downtown. If two aldermen were not enough for 100,000 or 150,000 people, then they could have three aldermen. I might point out the city of Toronto at one time had three aldermen per ward, and the city was smaller. We did away with one because it seemed proficient to do so, and it works well.

Toronto has tried all these things. The history of Toronto is a public operation, and I am always apprehensive of these people that look down on what is commonly called politicians. I am proud of that. There are very few who can enter into that debate and situation and have the same record. You may

say that about every business. You can have many proficient people in a business, but can you have, and while we all strive in public life to have proficiency, that is possible, and I uphold it with all the pride I have, and I will fight it with the energy I have those who suggest we look at it differently than any other businessman. With what we have to do it with, I think we can make democracy work, and the City of Toronto has, sir, in view of all the things that have been cast on its shoulders to bear over this long period of time, and that should never have been.

I might also say I think Toronto was very inefficient and very negligent in the last few years that it didn't do something about it. As you know since I got in I have never stopped hounding, hounding, hounding, hounding on this score. If that had been done before we certainly would have been moving long ago.

If they had had the good sense to appoint you in those days, Mr. Commissioner, so perhaps by my cry and those of us who stirred things up who had a lot to do with a capable judge --

THE COMMISSIONER: That is very flattering, but perhaps you should wait until you see my report.

MR. LAMPORT: Well, Mr. Commissioner, it would not be hard to understand; what you will do will be one very cautiously attended to. I am not afraid of that. However, Mr. Commissioner, I say this to you, and I say I have known you for a number of years as you have known me, Mr. Commissioner: I have debated

this question strongly, and at no time have I ever indicated that you could not be counted upon to do the fair and just thing.

However, Mr. Commissioner, I do think that because of the problems that have been created, because of what we have gone through, because it has gone on so long and because of the enormous undertaking on your shoulders, I would think and I would ask that you would consider a plebiscite of the people. Some would say "How would you hold a plebiscite? How would you hold an election in this area?" Those are stumbling words to say you can't elect people. You can elect them in the Province, you can elect them in the Federal Government or anyplace else where there are engineering minds or enterprising minds to do so.

We have had a recent plebiscite on the matter of fluoridation, and as such it could work just as well, and on the same basis as the question of fluoridation. I do believe there will be some refinements that you would certainly see unquestionably, and an astute man can't help but see inequity and inequalities, and these things might be offered as suggestions, should be added to whatever the result might be.

However, I do urge you, if you would, to consider that side of it, and I say so of course because I am one who has so strongly been attached to this and have seen both sides of it, and the enormous job in the transit field that this city had to face, and we developed a transit system for the area next to none I guess in the world from a small area of Toronto

-- Metropolitan area, which was my task and asked to be done by Mr. Gardener after I had done my work in getting this thing working along with me and the rest of Council.

I would also like to draw to your attention, Mr. Commissioner, a couple of new items that have come up since this brief was even completed. I was in the Council yesterday and so the staff went ahead and put it together, and that is why it was a little late getting here for your staff.

Here we are in the City of Toronto -- this could never happen with amalgamation -- we don't get any hospital taxes and yet they have to have services as well as anybody else. Health, that is from our Health Department to keep the area clean, street-cleaning and all services, fire and police. On Queen Street West the psychiatric hospital, and I am sure you are familiar with it, 999 Queen Street is assessed at $2,993,000. A considerable tax every year would be available and should be available for this. The psychiatric hospital over here next to the Women's College Hospital and is moving over to the other side of St. George Street in the university area is assessed at 507,000 now which is a total of $3,501,000. We get no taxes.

North York Township has Sunnybrook Hospital in it, and which has collected full taxes -- I can't give you the figure -- but full taxes, and I am advised by Mr. Frank Brown through our Commissioner, full federal taxes which of course is a grant in lieu, but

it is a generous grant in lieu not based on the other things we get for public buildings in Toronto, and this hospital includes in that school rates. This is where this picayune attitude comes in; while nobody knows about it, it seems to look all right. What do you think else happens in this case? Toronto supplies fire services to them and North York are paid for it. Toronto supplies it, and we get from $2,000 to $3,000 a year for it. Now, how ridiculous and upset can you be on borderlines?

These are the things that couldn't occur in a centrally controlled Metropolitan government elected by the people to deal with all things equally, and all human beings equally.

There is another shining example of the inequities and injustices that various councils, not trying to bring as injustices, but they come after various governments are on their own instead of a uniform procedure.

Here we are with the province getting nothing for these two hospitals. We get nothing for the other two hospitals, none of them.

Dealing with Item 4, Mr. Commissioner, the top figures on there, if I may point out, Mr. Commissioner, the library, Harbour Commission, there is the university which is down a little farther, if you would mark that, please, and then hospitals down the fourth from the bottom, and above, Metro properties and parklands. Metro properties and parklands, Harbour Commission, Library Board, Canadian National Exhibition and city

properties -- forget this -- but hospitals of $48,000,000 assessment, Mr. Commissioner, which would be at $3,000,000 alone on that a year would be taxes into Toronto. Used by everybody. Then you take the universities, and we have got to supply the services for it. $56,000,000, and that is only the start, Mr. Commissioner, because of the land they are acquiring. Some of the new land is in that. $56,000,000, and the City of Toronto bears all the complete services of that; the smallest homes in the area. All borne by Toronto. Surely that again would indicate is this a big area for purposes of being big or for purposes of making one area do all the paying and the others doing all the benefiting?

Then we go to the other Crown properties. Mostly in Toronto. We get a payment in lieu of them and we don't get educational grants on those, Mr. Commissioner. On Federal we get a share of educational in lieu of; provincial grants we only get a payment in lieu for general purposes, fire protection, street-cleaning and so on. Now, they are mostly in the City of Toronto, so that if this was shared by everybody, Mr. Commissioner, you can see that Toronto can easily carry the load of bringing the standards up of the other municipalities that might choose to go as they have for many, many years and continue that way, and yet we will still be not any higher in tax rates. I think we will be in saving; I think they will eventually be in saving because certainly if we look at it, most of the officials from Metro were taken from the City of

Toronto and have become proficient there, and moved up. The Treasurer, T.T.C., the Works Commissioner, Roads Commissioner, Assessor; all the big offices have all moved up, but that is just a few which have served my memory, and I would urge, Mr. Commissioner, and you have these tables. I know you have got to hear a lot of others, but there is some very important information. I know it is a case; I know you will study it; I know you will give us benefit of the doubts. I have tried to just highlight so that you could not be overloaded. I don't think that will help our case any either.

The inspectors to the buildings; we don't permit a careless examination of buildings and plans. It shows comparison with various municipalities, and yet they have had enormous buildings going on in their area. Against Toronto's 20 to 30 million, North York 70 million and yet we have got more people who examined the proper construction and carried out all the building codes provincially and federally more than they have. It would indicate many things to you I am sure.

Also the parking requirements in apartment buildings. Surely this is something that has to be examined because anyone knows one municipality can induce them when they cut parking requirements way down. True, it may not be a serious requirement, but then again it is equally true that it is often at the will of the builder who says "Now, I will come here and build or I don't. There are twelve other places to choose from. You want me, you get me on certain conditions." and this is bargaining that will never happen with the

boundaries eliminated. Have the ward boundaries; have it on the basis of those and astute people who would have to have some proper results and answer for it. Nobody is answering for it. No one. It is still the same old factory and the same old mill construction, and satisfied with the same old bookkeeping methods because those of us who want to be progressive can't foist on the others the necessary requirements.

One more item , Mr. Commissioner, Item 13 if I may draw your attention to it. You have had most of these things drawn to your attention. There is a clipping there on fire service you notice in here, and I ask you to be good enough to look into the heads of department report which indicate the ridiculousness of high buildings being built in area municipalities and not a fire truck in order to serve them with the proper ladders. These are the crazy parts of it. Buildings high enough that would require proper equipment, but because they could get by living so close to Toronto -- there are three or four of them that have contracts with Toronto to do their fire service for them, and you will see in that clipping it says "For example, Scarborough residents living in the southwest corner of the Township are only a few blocks from Toronto's Woodbine Fire Hall, but nearly two miles from a Scarborough station." How ridiculous.

Time is important. Here is another. One last paragraph: "Recently, there was a fire on a suburban street a block from the City boundary line. A citizenrang the city fire alarm box by mistake and

the City Firemen attended, had the fire out and were leaving when the suburban Department arrived." Yet many of these municipalities, Mr. Commissioner, haven't contracts with the City, but how could we refuse to attend a serious fire and the equipment on their borders? It is not logical.

We ask not to be kept in that position. We pay $500 a year insurance policy alone just as a stand-by interim policy, Mr. Commissioner, just so that if we do go to these area municipalities we will have legal liability protection.

Here is another thing. This City needs badly a fire training school. Day to day and a continuous refresher course to deal with firemen to use and know how to use for their own safety and survival the new modern equipment that comes out monthly or yearly. We can't afford this, but the area can, and the area needs it. The Province has one for captains and above, Mr. Commissioner. They are no good to our people.

While we have a very proficient and efficient Fire Department, you well know how ridiculous it is to think that on the borders as you can read on page 13 there are clippings, clippings that the public understand and get before them. All of the things that go on in Metro are not published, but these are some of the things, and I have asked you to read the report of Heads of Departments, pages 206 and 215 which will indicate how they believe how ridiculous the statement is. The other item I ask you to read is the Gathercole

Report which I ask you to read one particular item which is clearly indicative of what the amalgamation process will bring for us, but just to see all the items, and there are dozens and dozens more. I would certainly be very glad any time that you might feel without embarrassment -- I am not one of those who you saw ahead of time so I would like everybody to know while many were seen and bragged about it you and I have not contacted in any way, so this is purely my own view and your own comments or your own view, and I am glad perhaps now that nobody can say perhaps I was helped in my brief because everybody thinks some time I will need it, but I will ask you whether you think I do.

However, it is a compliment and honour to be here, Mr. Commissioner. I am sure you will give it every consideration. I would urge that they be elected. I would urge that you see the very dangerous way we are heading and with anything else but amalgamation you continue the experiment and the chaos.

THE COMMISSIONER: When you talk of my calls on other people, I hope you understand I made a courtesy call on the then mayor of Toronto, the late lamented Mayor Summerville.

MR. LAMPORT: Properly, of course.

THE COMMISSIONER: And I call on the chairman of the Metropolitan Council. I am going to call on the Mayors and Reeves of the area municipalities.

MR. LAMPORT: I hope you don't misunderstand me in saying it.

THE COMMISSIONER: I hope you don't think I discussed any brief.

MR. LAMPORT: Mr. Commissioner, you and I can talk all the time, and I have every respect for you. Even though you were brainwashed on Metropolitan Council one day and couldn't do anything about it. I knew it was as embarrassing for you as it was for me to tell me to keep quiet. Those various things don't affect me.

THE COMMISSIONER: I don't boast, but I still want to meet the person who can brainwash me; the person or group.

MR. LAMPORT: I am sure.

THE COMMISSIONER: Just by way of summary, Mr. Lamport, I would like you to understand one or two things clearly. Do you mind?

MR. LAMPORT: Certainly.

THE COMMISSIONER: You were one of the fathers of Metropolitan Toronto.

MR. LAMPORT: Yes, sir.

THE COMMISSIONER: And you felt at that time that in view of the critical problems which this area faced, that Metropolitan government was an appropriate solution at the time?

MR. LAMPORT: Appropriate start to the solution, may I say that?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. You have put it that way. Reading your briefs, and I say "briefs" because there are two, and as I said earlier I read them carefully.

MR. LAMPORT: Thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER: You agree that the Metropolitan Corporation has effectively solved some of the critical problems which were faced in 1953? Am I right there?

MR. LAMPORT: May I add to this my "Yes" to that would mean I extended the answer more than I have done. May I correct it this way by saying anything that was done up to the first two or three years was done fine, but from then on everything could have been done as well or better if amalgamated. I don't think it should have gone on past three or four years. There is no evidence to prove it needed to be because everything was neglected after that.

We planned the Gardiner Expressway in 1953. When I was Mayor this was planned so that was not done since. Water and sewer was planned. These were all on the drafting board. The monies have been provided, but I am pointing out the plan to keep the scheme working where these municipalities did not have finances for their local problems, and the financing necessary to finance water works and the streets and other requirements.

In Toronto, of course -- we conclude even the reports of the Heads of Department said it was a very bad adventure for Toronto. Mr. Lasalles and Mr. Gray both in recorded statements said it is going to be very serious for Toronto; it is going to cost us another 1 percent interest on our bonds, and it was proven, and it did because we took on this extra

load. This was a statement of Mr. Lasalles', unrefuted and written because Heads of Departments met on Council's instructions, although I voted alone, they were able to bring about a motion that asked Heads of Departments about Bill 80, and they were emphatically against this procedure that I wanted, but I said it had to be; these area municipalities must be served as they are not on water. They were paying us a bonus for water. The under-development was serious, and yet we had to extend so there had to be a meeting on these problems. Mr. Gardiner was a great tower of strength, but after three or four years it was a case of a squatting position and you could do your ball-catching there as well as you could sitting down.

THE COMMISSIONER: Finally, Mr. Lamport, I also gather from your brief that in the interest of the overall community you are recommending amalgamation, recognizing that the economies which you anticipate may not be felt for five or six years and that raising the standards to the level of Toronto in the outer municipalities may in fact mean a higher overall tax rate for the area?

MR. LAMPORT: It could very well be, sir. I would point out to you of the things that will be transferred we will be paying for some increase in improved standards that they would like to have and they would be paying for some extra things like the University and the harbour expansion. On the overall, if I may be general that way, I agree with you, sir.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much, Mr. Lamport.

MR. LAMPORT: It is a pleasure. Thank you.

SUBMISSION OF COMPTROLLER WILLIAM L. ARCHER

MR. ARCHER: Sir, I appear alone in presenting personal comments which arise, I feel, out of five years of experience; four or five years on Metro, several years on the Metro Planning Board, and I would say a visit to Miami and a discussion with their officials; a visit to Winnipeg and discussion with their officials; and a two-week seminar at the University of Denver on metropolitan matters involving professors from universities all across the United States.

THE COMMISSIONER: You should be the Royal Commissioner, not me!

MR. ARCHER: I am very grateful, sir, not to have to make the report and make only a brief. I can only say I come as a graduate of McGill, sir, and I think I am perhaps one of the few who has ever reached such heights in Toronto.

I would reemphasize, sir, that my presentation is a personal one. The views of the majority of my colleagues on one Council do not necessarily agree with it in public.

I have, sir, my brief to my left and I have what I call my speaking notes on my right, which were only completed last night and therefore I have not a formal copy. I have a tissue copy if you would care to have it.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. I have, of course, read the brief.

MR. ARCHER: Sir, I am aware you have

read every document. My only anticipation was that I might turn up a document you have not covered on the subject.

THE COMMISSIONER: These are my notes, as you will see.

MR. ARCHER: With the blessing of optometry I cannot see the notes at this distance, not even that they are there.

Someone has suggested that unless there is amalgamation it is not really a drastic change. It is my opinion that the changes that are necessary, while maintaining a present type of system of Metropolitan government, must be and need to be drastic. There are vital improvements required in our system; improvements which will be necessary to lay the foundation for the continued growth of this community for more than the next ten years, possibly a basis for twenty or thirty years.

I would stress the word "drastic". Some may think that when one is not for amalgamation one is for the status quo, which I am not.

Now there has been little talk about empires. The task today is not a matter of deciding which group will have an empire, or which group shall lose an empire. It is important to set up an effective basis of government, set out the boundaries, the functions, and how to strengthen one of the key points, the senior level of our Metropolitan system. It is most vital that the senior level become most dominant as a basis of a strong central government.

In dealing with this, sir, I would like to repeat what I have on page 1, the factors to be considered: (1) responsible, responsive government close to the electorate; (2) a system of distribution of the work load and of the decision-making operation on a practical and effective basis; (3) an equitable tax rate, which recognizes that there is not full equality as to supply or need of services; (4) a system of boundaries which is flexible enough to provide for further development both within Metro and beyond its present boundaries.

As an example, if we adjust Pickering or adjust the Township of Toronto we have a flexible manner of doing that.

THE COMMISSIONER: Do you have a reason for mentioning the northern municipalities?

MR. ARCHER: I am very conscious, sir, of the situation of Markham and Vaughn and how Metro through the Planning Board have controlled their development of staging. No matter where you draw the boundary there will be somebody on the other side of it. If you push it north then you deprive the County and that strength may be helping to maintain the rest of the County.

In our development of Metro we are following the ancient pattern of County government; a pattern of government which is now being carefully studied; a pattern of government in which experiments are being undertaken, such as in the County of Wentworth on the matter of welfare; as to how it provides effective

regional planning, a basis of sharing in costs and of sharing in the making of those decisions.

In one of the Counties to the west of us, Peel County, there is discussion as to what the voting representation should be to the tax basis that they pay. To my mind the County and Metro are extremely similar and what we are setting in Metro today may be a pattern for the rest of the Province even though it involves some very drastic changes in their boundaries.

Now, sir, in my brief when I refer to the relative equality of population and assessment in establishing a district system, I must say that I think we should also consider geography in this as well. It is my submission that we should be trying to outline the boundaries of the district by communities of interest and by those dividing lines of geography -- natural ones such as our rivers, and the more modern and artificial ones created by railways and expressways. It is well to recall the discussion in Scarborough that the Gardiner Expressway would split one of their communities into two parts.

On page 9 I have stated that I see no sanctity in the boundaries of the present municipalities. There are boundaries today in which it is impossible to tell when one changes from one municipality to another. This is why I feel that while the present boundaries of the municipalities may be guide lines to assist, they should not be taken as definitive lines.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Archer, you

refer in two or three places in your brief to a district system. By "district" do you mean an area municipality or a borough, as some people call it, or what do you exactly mean by "district"?

MR. ARCHER: I have been trying to use a nomenclature which was able to show a difference from what existed now in actual fact and what the proposal is. My general description has been that I referred to a new Metro Council and District Councils. Sometimes I have called them Goldenberg Districts. I would limit them to District Councils to use a distinguishing factor. If one says a borough or area municipality many people will think that you mean the type of area municipality that we have today. I envision a different type and therefore call it a District because I think the Metro level of government has to be strengthened, has to be given those functions that are area-wide. There should be no question in anybody's mind when they ask who is the political head of Toronto, using that word to apply to this area, that it is the head of the senior level of government.

THE COMMISSIONER: Would you have a Reeve or Mayor of a District, District Councillors?

MR. ARCHER: If I use the word "Reeve", one thinks of a Township. If I use the word "Mayor", one thinks of a City. In my mind we would almost set up a new District with a new District head. He would be the senior person of government and be elected possibly in a similar manner to the present Mayors and

Reeves and be the head of that District; but the distinction I would draw in this is, I think, that the Metro government has to be substantially strengthened.

We have to have a re-grouping of what I would call the Districts into a relatively equal basis. In essence my personal feeling is that Swansea and Leaside are too small. I wonder if Toronto is not too large? I wonder myself if the people at the east and west extremities of Toronto ever see all of the attention and consideration that they would have received if they had a district level of government closer to their problems?

This is why I say: Forget the municipal boundaries and try and set up a District level on a community of interests basis.

THE COMMISSIONER: You are suggesting something entirely new and different, something which doesn't exist anywhere; or does it?

MR. ARCHER: I think the pattern of the principle of it exist in, for example, the borough system under the Greater London Council. I think our difficulty here is, sir, the disproportion of the size of the area municipalities and to try and improve that at this time because I think if we make that drastic change we will lay the foundation which will make the programme last for a longer and longer period. It is a much more drastic change and I don't think it has been mentioned in any of the briefs that I have seen.

In setting this up, sir, I can see a transfer of key functions to Metro and yet I can see

many functions that should be retained on the District level.

Now on page 3 I have been discussing what I will call the tremendous work load that is now placed upon members of Council. I am the second member of Council that has appeared and said: "I have had a difficult time getting the brief to you because of the various meetings of Council that have to be attended." There is a great variety and a great quantity of decisions that have to be made.

I would like to particularly stress on this matter of the aspects of planning and zoning and, sir, while I do not have many copies in support of this particular point, I show you as Exhibits first what is almost, I think, a museum piece because I was told that I had to return it. It is the master plan for the City of Toronto and environs of December 31, 1943. This document is so small, sir, that the pages are not even numbered. I counted them and they come to 16 pages; yet they set out fairly clearly a descriptive plan for this area.

By contrast, sir, I have this weighty document which is merely the draft of the report on the Official Plan of 1959.

THE COMMISSIONER: Of which I have a copy.

MR. ARCHER: I would like to note in the record it runs to 13 chapters, 58 plates, 66 tables and 42 lists of figures. Even today, sir, the latest draft of the Metropolitan Official Plan is still only

in course of preparation.

I mention this because I think this is one aspect where there can be a separation of function between the Metro level and the District level.

I might say, sir, that there is an additional Exhibit to show the volume that exists on this and how the District level still has problems to solve, which must be about two inches thick.

Now the Metropolitan level should be concerned that no decision on zoning or on planning is contrary to the best interests of the area. It should have the responsibility for developing the key lines of transportation, of water supply, of sewage lines, of major parks; but I think when you get down to the local areas there is a way that much of these matters could be handled on a local level as supplementary to the major decisions. To my mind this is where there could be sufficient knowledge. This is where the residents may have a full opportunity and a rightful opportunity to present their views, for their views must be considered. It is important that we fully consider those who live on the land even more than for those who wish to live off the land in dealing with the matters as they affect zoning.

Now there has been some comment on the point that the Metropolitan Official Plan has not been adopted. One of the reasons for this is that there are several people, which includes myself, who are reluctant to adopt the Metropolitan Official

Plan and place an even stronger straightjacket on ourselves until there is a revision in the legislation governing planning decisions.

It already takes many, many months to process a decision. One of the briefs suggested that zoning by-laws were put through in six months. We very seldom get one through under the present process in under eight or nine months and from the time of application it could run upwards of 18 months or two years. The adoption of the Metropolitan Official Plan could add many more months and until that legislation is straightened out, and a proper procedure adopted, it would be foolhardy for this community to adopt the plan as an Official Plan. It is quite right and proper that it should be followed as a guide and most of the decisions in this area have been following the proposals and principles laid out in the draft Official Plan.

Now, sir, coming back to the subject of the division of the functions between the two levels of government. I come back and stress zoning and planning. I have sat on the Metro Planning Board and I have seen their efforts from the Metro point of view to ensure that the decisions conform with the plans for this area. Yet the day-to-day detail of the individual categories of zoning, of the specialties that develop with the subdivision plan, and the growth of the municipalities, of the site development control, so an increase in the detail of decisions, and decision, I think, sir, should be made by elected representatives

rather than by appointed officials.

There is a problem on this that in errors of omission the Metro government at this time perhaps does not have as much jurisdiction as it does on an error of commission because they can take action to prevent a by-law; take action to prevent a particular public works; or to have a change in the Official Plan. There is a difficulty at the moment as to Metro being able to do something when an area or municipality or district omits to do something that should be done. This is, I say, a difficulty that is there and I am not certain what the effective answer is on it. It is a problem, sir, that will go to the man who writes the report and not to the man who writes the brief.

Now on the division of functions, I am a member of the Toronto Public Library Board and I was there when they prepared their brief. I concur with their brief, sir. I think it gave a very excellent summary of the situation on the libraries and showed how that particular function could be divided between the two levels of government. I feel on the matters of streets and roads, where Metro now has 30% of the roads which carry 70% of the traffic, the area municipalities have 70% of the roads and carry 30% of the traffic, I think we have a reasonable division of jurisdiction. There will be occasionally differences but it is a separation of the work load and the decisions.

On the matter of the present procedure

for the disposal of refuse the local levels may arrange for the collection of it in a manner and pattern suitable to each of the various Districts. If the District wants to have it collected twice a week and wrapped up in bags and pay for that service then they have the privilege of doing it. Another District may insist on it being put on the street rather than picked up at the back. They can decide and then it can go to the central areas and the incinerators or land fill projects underway, such as the proposal for rebuilding the Scarborough Bluffs. This can be done by Metro making the major decisions at that level.

You can have two separate functions. There is the ability to divide them and the decisions don't conflict and will not overlap either the local level or the area level on the handling of the matter.

THE COMMISSIONER: What would Metro do exactly? Would Metro set minimum standards?

MR. ARCHER: I think that this is one thing they can do. You touch on something there. If you have one City you have a minimum standard. In essence Metro could set a minimum standard as to the way the material has to be when it comes in to Metro but the District at its expense and at its choice may choose any variation of that standard and over a period of time each District may rise to the same high standard.

On the distribution of water the present method is almost a wholesaling of water from Metro at a uniform minimum standard rate. If you look

at the brief you will see different water rates in different municipalities. There is a difference in how it is handled. Some have meters and some don't. Some have flat charges. Each District can set their own method which does not interfere with the area, whether they meter or flat rate. I might say that all indications I have seen on the matters of rates indicate if we have the one amalgamated city the water rates of the City of Toronto will have an even further increase.

THE COMMISSIONER: What you say about the distribution of water here, does it apply to the Hydro, the local Hydro systems?

MR. ARCHER: I think from the Provincial level you have a Hydro Commission which I would call the senior level of government. Then you have the District level, which we have at the present time. It could again be brought into the Districts so that from the Ontario Hydro to the District Hydro there is very seldom a problem coming up that affected the area. I would substitute for senior level, Metro level, an Ontario Hydro Commission and District distribution. I can see where the members could be appointed rather than by separate election.

On your comment of the other day I don't see a great deal of difficulty in working that out because -- I am not going to say "control" because the Hydro professes to be controlled by the municipalities rather than to control them.

On the matter of welfare, sir, which

is the topic of much concern, I think that the real nub of the problem is the method of apportioning the costs and I would prefer to leave it at a local administration of the operation, one that is closer to the people. It leaves more room for experimentation. I am satisfied that there are experiments we have conducted in the City of Toronto which we could not have done if we had one big area because of the difficulty of applying it on a larger basis. In the Districts you can experiment and in no subject is there more need for experimentation than on that. Today we in the City are carrying on three or four projects in conjunction with the Provincial Government. I know that even Dr. Rose, who had one approach on this, has modified his approach to a different one.

un 9/64
/EMT/je

Sir, when I am dealing with this matter of division of services, particularly on matters that affect health, welfare and education, I feel I can do no better than to refer to the statements of the Minister of Health, the Honourable Enoch Powell in the Hansard of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom on December 11, 1962, at pages 330, 331 and 337; and again to the debates of December 10. I am not sure if you have them or not. I can leave them with you. I think that it is an extremely interesting debate to read. The criticism there was not at the 2-level system. There is criticism of some of the boundaries. There was criticism concerning the special problem of education in the London County Council system. There was criticism by some that this was an effort by the Tories to deprive Labour of their control of the area. This was refuted at the time by the Daily Herald, and more effectively refuted at the subsequent election when Labour took two-thirds of the membership of the new Council. That is what they were arguing about; not about having a two-level system; not about that there should be some basis of dividing functions.

There was very great stress on committee functions in education, health and welfare at the borough or district level so that they could be close to the people. I appreciate that in their system of government, their central unitary sytem, they could exercise a higher degree of control than we do in ours. However, I think the way they have argued the point shows you this aspect of the division of functions

could be considered for our area.

On this matter of districts, I would like to say one of the functions when an area or a part of the community is affected by a metropolitan project, unless there is some organized administration to assemble and to present their views, it is extremely difficult. Now, ratepayer groups can do a very effective job, but they do not have that basis of everybody in the area contributing to them; they don't have the basis of sort of permanent staff and the research that is really available, and I use the illustration of the Spadina Expressway which was a Metro project, which was part of the Metro system. The route and design of that had effect on the local areas. True, the Township of York, the Village of Forest Hill, the City of Toronto, were able to make effective presentations to make changes, changes which revised the price by about 10 percent, but it protected residential amenities.

I doubt, sir, if we had one Planning Board, one Council, if the people who were directly affected by it could have made their representations as effectively and as well so that there was a proper assembling of material. I think this is one of the points of having a district level because I believe the people of Metro are really speaking with one voice.

I think, sir, listening to the briefs you have is an indication there are various views from various parts of Metro. In almost every submission that has been made there has been some recognition of the need for districts for administrative purposes.

It is not considered possible to have everything operated, controlled, and serviced from a central location. This, then, means that there would be departmental administrative setups in various parts of Metro. They will be headed, if it is one city, by I will call them civic servants, and I touch on this in my commentary, sir, on the aspect of civic servants, and I distinguish between a civic servant and an elected official. An elected official is far more able to take up the cudgels in the interests of some citizen who may be affected by it; an elected official is able to reach into something on all levels; he can go to bat for them in a way quite different than the civic servant. I respect the civic servant, and even the civic servant himself recognizes that his status is restricted as an employee rather than one who could really challenge the policy in public. So that I here attach on that quote from the famous report in England, not just local government, local self-government, and being a politican, sir, I would say I have seen very few commissioners or deputy commissioners deprived of office. There is hardly an election goes by at which this does not happen to some politician, so that the public who are affected will have a greater control over the people making the public decisions.

I feel that this is something that has to be considered if you are going to have this form of district, and I have not seen a brief that has not used a district in some form or another.

THE COMMISSIONER: Your district will

really be a municipality with elected officials?

MR. ARCHER: Yes, sir.

THE COMMISSIONER: Responsible for local policy?

MR. ARCHER: Yes, sir.

THE COMMISSIONER: And a local civil service?

MR. ARCHER: Yes, sir, but not to do anything that would be contrary to that which was area-wide in policy; but you could have an area-wide policy, and there might be ninety-eight different ways of carrying it out on the local level without disturbing that policy.

THE COMMISSIONER: How would the area-wide body, presumably Metro Council, enforce the application of its policy? By the district?

MR. ARCHER: I think it controls it first by capital expenditures.

THE COMMISSIONER: Which it does now?

MR. ARCHER: Which it does now. So that there is no problem there. Secondly, it is a matter of siting of buildings in this way, for example, with schools we have shifted to a greater degree of control by the Metro level, siting of schools and types of buildings that are built. It could do it by establishing minimum standards.

We have evolved uniform traffic by-laws and policies, and we can work this out in co-operation with the Minister who has today the right to approve all by-laws on such matters. We can do it through the

matter of zoning in that a zoning by-law or change of the official plan is processed through the -- not through the Metropolitan Corporation today, but through the Metropolitan Planning Board, so that if there is a by-law or official planning change which is not in accordance with the area, then they can object. But even today with the by-laws at the Planning Board, the Metro Planning Board, only the occasional by-law comes to the attention of the Board because the majority of them are in conformity with the plan.

An example of one which may or may not is the proposed shopping plaza in Etobicoke, down at the bottom of No. 27 and the Queen Elizabeth. The local municipality proposes the by-law, but it doesn't go through until Metro is satisfied that from the area-wide it is clear. I am satisfied on most of these matters that effective control could be there, still retaining a fairly wide and effective jurisdiction at the local level.

THE COMMISSIONER: But it is really a matter of semantics. You are suggesting four or five area municipalities under a Metropolitan Council?

MR. ARCHER: Yes. It is in a sense semantics, although I sometimes say I am anti-semantic. I am trying to show it is not the same as it is today because this would be quite different although the form is similar; one level, other levels of different parts underneath, but I think one of the key things is a fairly substantial revision of the boundaries to achieve some relative equity.

I think it is a disproportion which has been one of the sources of our defects today. I have even heard it suggested they should be given numbers rather than names so that they don't stir up any emotional feelings. It is very hard to cheer for No. 4 District rather than some historical name that might be there.

Now, I come, sir, in extending this, and I think this is something that has not been touched on or I haven't seen the phrase used as to focal points of decisions which I did refer to in my previous brief at page 5, and I have it in my notes here today. It doesn't matter what level of government you are at, whether it is in the Federal Government or Queen's Park or almost any size Council, the tendency is for the decisions to come to a focal point of decision thus involving often fewer than half a dozen people who make the decisions. I think the point is here if we overrode that focal point of decision for Metro and have to have all our decisions go through it, that we will not get the best form of government, and I would say to take away to these districts the making of the minor decisions, the local decisions, so that the higher level can go on with its major decisions.

I think one of the reasons that Metropolitan government has been successful here is that Metro Council has in general had to make major decisions of policy and the other districts have looked after the other types of decision. I am sure if we get Metro cluttered with all the problems we

settle at the other councils, that they would never get around to making big major decisions that have to be made. It is one of these problems that would be there and these decisions, minor though they may be in effect or in title or as they affect us, could have considerable effect on the people in the particular area where it is. You can change the simple matter of a one-way street and radically affect the residents of a particular section, and yet it is not something that really has to go to a Council of representatives from all over to be settled.

I touched earlier, sir, on this matter of the standards, minimum standards, and I am afraid if we had one single government we would achieve perhaps a common standard for the whole, but very likely the lowest common standard for the whole of the community whereas if we have different standards, it may be that we not only have the lowest common standard but in some areas we have the highest standard. I don't think it is altogether wrong that in some areas the standards should be higher than in others if, and this is the proviso, each of the areas has an opportunity on its own to rise up to the other standards. The area can make its own decision as to what standard it may wish to have and what standard it may wish to pay for provided it comes up to at least minimum standards for the whole of Metro.

Now, in dealing with the matter of taxes and the tax rate, and in a great effort to seek equity, I have been very impressed, sir, by the report which

was submitted by yourself and Mr. Blake to the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg on revenues and taxation. I assume you not only read this, but you wrote it so you would be familiar with it. Such statements as "Where a number of municipalities constitute a single geographic and economic unit, a single community, it is clear that business does not serve nor does it benefit solely from the municipality within the boundaries of which it chose to be physically located."

This is so true of the great commercial industrial assessment of the central business district that it is not solely for the benefit of the municipality in which it is located, but that its benefits derive from and should be attributed to the other areas. Sometimes and perhaps this morning some of the people in this municipality have lost sight of this point. In the report it is stated: "There is little ground to support the argument that business taxes in the Metropolitan area should be reserved to the particular municipality in which the business happens to be located. The business tax and the personal property tax may properly be considered an area tax." I should qualify that with the phrase business tax there is quite different from the business tax that we think of in our municipality in Ontario.

THE COMMISSIONER: I was going to make that qualification for my own protection.

MR. ARCHER: Thank you, sir. I am glad I was able to anticipate, but I think the principle

that is there that a tax that does come from a business commercial industrial source is one which is generally beneficial to the whole area. The central business district of Toronto could not be prosperous and survive without places for the people to sleep, have schools and roads to support it even though they may be beyond the technical municipal boundary of the central business district.

I would suggest, sir, that we give consideration to arranging for some way of shifting this type of tax revenue or perhaps at least leaving only a fixed proportion of it to the district level so that the general benefit of commercial and industrial assessment shall be available to the taxpayers and residents of the entire area. This would have some effect on diminishing the present competition, and I note "which is said to exist". I am not sure that it does exist, with respect to seeking commercial and industrial assessment. I think if we could resolve the problem of that distribution of that commercial revenue so that it was distributed more equitably area-wide and in the districts, we would do a lot to resolve the arguments and differences that come up in our present-day discussions.

Now, some say that if you remove this commercial industrial assessment bait for development, that the area may take the attitude as some areas do "We only want residences of a certain quality, of a certain type and nature. Put the industry over there, not over here because we will still get the benefit of

the assessment of it." So that there is going to have to be some balancing of that. I think that the interest in development has got to be there quite apart from assessment. It has to be there for the social economic use of the scarcest commodity we have in this area, and that is land, and using it in a way that benefits people. This is a most tremendous challenge. This function alone has had a very tremendous influence in the matter of planning. In the Gathercole report you will find one of the tables on planning where we were spending something like fifty or sixty thousand dollars. We are now spending ten times as much within ten years. There is every sign that the amount of money, of staff and of energies on this particular project is increasing. I know in our own municipality we have not been as quick as we should have been, and there is much delay that we must overcome, and I think we must do something on this matter. It is a tremendous burden.

On the matter of user taxes and making taxes on a basis more equitable between those receiving benefits and those who pay the taxes, and the report in Winnipeg touches on the point if we have area-wide taxes there will always be a feeling between one part of Metro and another as to whether it is receiving its share of the services.

I don't think I need to amplify on that aspect, sir, because I think there was considerable comment on it in Winnipeg as to whether each area gets the same benefit from its taxes as the others do. Now,

sir, whether we have a single council or various councils, we will not wipe out the differences that sometimes exist. Is it to be suggested that they will not be known under different names such as the fringe and the core, the east against the west, even in Parliament in Ottawa where everything is supposed to be brought together you have east against the west. In the United States they still have differences of the north against the south. You have it in even our own council where there are differences as between this part of the city and that part of the city, and I feel that this would continue, whatever form you had, and it is not eliminated however you change the structure. I don't think a re-grouping of the people to be elected will eliminate intense debate, dissension and acrimony. As a matter of fact, I am not sure that they should be deleted because often they stir the issue to the core of the problem and expose weaknesses, and if the case hasn't got merit it sometimes is exposed in intense debate.

On the matter of taxes, sir, it has been said by some that they want a single tax rate, a uniform tax rate for everyone. It has been said by some there are thirteen tax rates. Actually the combination of tax rates that could apply in the area of Metropolitan Toronto is almost without number. Very few realize in some of the townships there are area charges. There are four or five of these different tax charges for areas related to different types of services provided, street lighting, on sewage, on

garbage collection and on various things.

I had a table from Etobicoke and Scarborough, and I began to try to work out how many combinations there could be, and I was no mathematician, and I got lost in the hundreds so that we do have a —— varying tax rate.

If we have a single tax rate across Metro, there will be a demand for equality of service. Inasmuch as we are unable to provide that equality of service, there will then be a demand for an area system of tax rates. It would be better in my opinion to have this done through districts than to try to have it worked out on a Metropolitan basis.

Both Etobicoke and Scarborough have today varied tax rates for differing parts of the municipality. How could one expect a farmer in Agincourt to pay at the same rate as a businessman downtown who is getting the advantage of many services which are provided in that area when the farmer in Scarborough may not have sewers, may not have garbage collection, may not have a street lighting system. I would say no matter how they change the legislation to vary the assessment the feeling will still be there if there is a uniform tax rate because the talk of equality of charges will mean talk for provision of equality of service. It is my submission that this is not practical to achieve, and that we must achieve a division of the taxes and of services in the way that is practical and feasible. This, sir, is not to say that the people in this community should not have the advantages of

special services on a Metropolitan basis regardless of municipal or district boundaries.

It is sometimes urged, sir, that if somebody lives in one municipality he therefore has certain dental services; if he lives outside, he doesn't have it. I know of an illustration, sir, within a municipality that if you live on one side, and I will say the famous name of Yonge Street, your children can go to a school which is newer, which has much better equipment, which is more accessible than you can if you live on the other side of Yonge Street and live even further away from an older school to which the children have to go. So that the differences that can occur are not attributable to municipal boundaries or anything else.

If there is a project, I would use the retarded children, and I use even special dental or something that is a project for a group in the community that should be provided and supported on a Metropolitan basis and should be available to anyone from any part of Metro. But the basic standard would be available through his district. This may not, of course, occur immediately. Again, the history of the retarded child. Twenty years ago this was not a project that was really considered. Today it is a project and the provincial government itself is making a very substantial payment and making it available to people not just in the Metropolitan centres but throughout the province.

These items will grow and develop. I

think they can grow better from a smaller district than they can from a larger unit.

In examining the briefs that have come in, and the transcript, sir, I was struck by the fact that one of the main critical problems upon which attention is directed -- this is page 12 of my notes, this morning, sir -- the note at the top was a humorous injection that I hoped it would not be settled on the basis of some midnight vote; I do not exclude the use of midnight oil. One of the key points that has come out in the briefs and transcript is on the matter of housing. There have been people who have said it is the fault of Metro or the municipality or an area that this has not made progress. I think, sir, the record shows that Metro Council with the support of this community has requested both the provincial and federal government to revise the setup and improve the form of control of housing and development of housing and to set up a central authority for this Metropolitan area.

The responsibility for the failure today of our proceeding with low cost and subsidized housing for that group of the community is the responsibility of the other levels of government. I would say, sir, this might be something that was somewhat beyond their control because when I went into this, it comes under the Minister of Public Works in Ottawa, and in the space of six or seven years we have had five different ministers. I don't know that any portfolio perhaps has changed so frequently and has been so vital on the matter of housing because it does involve policy decisions that

a Minister has to take time to consider.

The need for this low-cost housing is illustrated in part by the Toronto brief which refers to the low average assessment of homes, the high cost of land and the difficulties of providing homes for those with incomes of less than $5,000 per annum. The average assessment is very low in the City of Toronto. This is because we have to have places for people with low incomes to live. It is this that is a problem because such re-development as is taking place often removes that housing accommodation.

It is interesting to note that those in the past who have been opposed to subsidized housing recognize today the responsibility of the community to help provide it. This lack is one of the most critical features of our area today. I think it should be made very clear that the responsibility for this is at other levels of government until they clear away the cobweb of procedures which holds back planning, decisions and development, and we in this area will be stymied no matter how we change our structure of government. This is something that while perhaps it is not related to structure of government, I would submit comes under the expression related matters affecting the government of the Metropolitan Toronto region because nothing is of greater importance to us than the housing of our people, particularly that part of the community which is unable to look after it, and I note, sir, in a report that the Metropolitan executive have before them this morning the solicitor states on granting

the Metropolitan Corporation some authority, that the Minister of Municipal Affairs specifically advised that no action was being taken in this case pending the report of the Royal Commission on Metropolitan Toronto. Therefore, sir, the structure of government and the structure of houses is a matter which will depend upon your report.

THE COMMISSIONER: I serve a useful purpose.

MR. ARCHER: There has never been any doubt about that, sir.

THE COMMISSIONER: Have you any views on what the Ontario Housing Corporation was established for in the closing days of the last session? What the Corporation may do by way of improving the situation of which you are complaining.

MR. ARCHER: As I recall, it is to work it out in consultation with the federal government, and it is a matter of getting the decision from the federal government to implement the Ontario Government as setting up the structure so that when we get a federal decision we can implement it. Actually there was so much legislstion came down in the last three weeks we are still trying to find out what affected us.

I would like to make one point. In my brief I have deliberately avoided any comment on figures, per capita this or per capita that or assessment or tax ranges because I realize from examination of the briefs it is easy for each one with a particular axe to grind to choose those figures which particularly

fit their case and perhaps disregard the figures which show a completely opposite position.

As I said at the commencement of my brief, I was trying to deal with only a few of the aspects, deal with them perhaps on the basis of establishing the principles that should apply because, sir, I feel if we can establish the principles and the general functions we can then have developed and can clothe the structure to carry out the needs of the area.

As for the figures and the details, I am sure that you are overwhelmed with the quantity of them that come before you and I would say, sir, no matter how much you read there would be almost an equal amount to be turned up inside of three weeks because of the quantity of outflow. It is a quantity that grows with too few people to read it all.

Based on the comments in the Winnipeg Report, it does not appear possible to achieve complete equality. It is my belief that we must not approach this on a penny for penny basis, or a dollar for dollar basis. I recall a comment, sir of one of the heads of an area municipality, who said that through Metro it was not that anyone had lost but all had gained; in essence not everyone may gain as much as another but each has gained. No matter how we strive there will always be some differences. Absolute equality cannot be achieved. There will be variations and to my mind it is more important to establish the basic principles themselves, somewhat similar to the programme followed in the United Kingdom. They established these principles they should follow on the boroughs and then they chose the Town Clerks of four of the municipalities in Britain and they were chosen to work out the details, to apply them to the boroughts. In a very great substance these were the lines and the distinctions that were established by the government, subject to review in the Committee of the House of Commons.

This is a way that I can see that we

can achieve what we need to achieve in this area -- a continuation of the federation with a revision of boundaries and functions and an improved formula for the distribution of area-wide costs, which could provide a flexible -- and I cannot say that there is any word that I have heard of late that applies more to what we need to have than something with some degree of flexibility for the future but at the same time a firm base on which a great future could be built for all the citizens of Metropolitan Toronto.

I would say "all the citizens" because we are all in this in one lump no matter how you may want to try and separate us.

I would say, sir, that I appreciate this opportunity of presenting my own personal views to the Commission and I extend every good wish for success to you, sir, in the tremendous task of making recommendations and determining the future of the local government in this area. I would say that anything we do in this area is a pattern for the Province of Ontario and for many areas outside the Province.

If there is any further information or material that I can provide to you, sir, out of my experience on City and Metro Councils I should be pleased to provide it. It was a pleasure, sir, for the first time this morning to meet you and to be before you.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Now I find that I have run behind time. I have asked Reeve

Davidson, Mrs. Dell and Mr. Farrow to appear this morning and I am prepared to continue now, but I will leave it to you. Reeve Davidson, would you prefer to go ahead now or to appear at two o'clock this afternnon?

REEVE DAVIDSON: Mr. Commissioner, I would like to go ahead now because I have a Metropolitan Council meeting this afternoon.

THE COMMISSIONER: I would be only too glad to. I am sorry I didn't plan as well as I might have planned, but it is the first time in eight weeks I have run behind.

MR. ARCHER: I apologize for contributing to the delay.

THE COMMISSIONER: No apologies are called for. Would you just give me five minutes?

---SHORT ADJOURNMENT.

SUBMISSION OF REEVE TRUE DAVIDSON, TOWNSHIP OF EAST YORK

THE COMMISSIONER: I am glad to welcome you back again, Miss Davidson.

MISS DAVIDSON: Thank you very much. I shall try not to cover the same ground as when I was making an appeal on behalf of my municipality.

THE COMMISSIONER: I notice you took some notes this morning.

MISS DAVIDSON: I am going to restrain myself from the comments which I might care to make if I were to deal with some of the statements item by item. I would have no time to comment on my own ideas.

I would like to make a general observation, however, about the briefs that I have had an opportunity of reading and the statements I have read in the Press, which I haven't had an opportunity of reading. As is to be expected they are coloured by the predispositions of the people who make them. I would hope that you would check all the briefs, including my own, very carefully; not only for such predispositions but also for facts and quotations out of context and other misleading material. I am sure that you will do that because I know that you have some facilities for research.

In particular I would say that most of the opponents of the Metropolitan system, some form of the Metropolitan system, concentrated their attention on the smaller communities, such as Swansea, which provide very few services. I don't think anybody thinks

a community such as Swansea can hope to survive.

I notice that the Reeve of Swansea itself has suggested that it be enlarged. You notice that East York feels its own size is ideal. North York thinks its size is good. Etobicoke thinks its size is good. Toronto, of course, thinks the bigger the better. The very small municipalities realize they are not a viable size and Mr. Kurata suggested Swansea be enlarged.

I would agree with Mr. Archer it is immaterial whether the areas are enlarged or cut down or how they are divided except for the fact that I think the present organization would furnish the basis for whatever new organization was to be set up. To recast the whole area completely I think would cause a great deal of unnecessary confusion.

There should be consolidation and possibly division, and as I have suggested in my own brief I have given some suggestions that seem to me practical and I would feel there ought to be some consideration of present political organizations because it is the skeleton on which the new flesh will be built up.

I would even hesitate to say there is nothing in a name. I think I have dealt with that rather fully in my brief. I was supposed to be a reformer in my youth, a few years ago, and it seems to be a tendency among people who want to reform things that you must change everything and they think by changing you make them better. Now at my ripe age I find

that when you change you have to change as little as necessary to get the result you want.

There has been a lot of talk about high standards this morning and it has been all through. This one of the moot points in any discussion of the Metro system. Now I claim that high standards are not necessarily to be identified with high costs. There is such a thing as plain living and high thinking and what we really are speaking of mostly is expensive standards.

Now I would suggest before you consider amalgamation of the Fire Department, before you consider the voluntary Fire Departments are unworkable and must be wiped out; or you consider it is not eligible that a municipality should buy its fire service from a neighbour; I suggest you look at the fire losses in the various communities and see whether the communities which don't spend as much have actually a higher percentage of fire losses than the communities which spend more in proportion to their assessment.

Similarly, in connection with health perhaps you could look at the infant mortality figures or the incidence of disease before you decide that the more expensive system has the higher standards. Perhaps you should measure the standards in terms of the ability to cope with a situation as they find it.

I would say there is real value in communities buying services from each other, or interchanging as some municipalities do. This is true in

fire services in most municipalities. There is only one which has a charge when it helps its neighbours. This is because of its own high costs. Now I haven't verified that. That is my impression.

Similarly in library services, most of the libraries in Metro are open libraries. I know that we accept people from any community in our library system.

In connection with Hydro, to which I did not refer in my brief but to which I would like to make a brief reference now, I am reminded of the wholesaler in business. There is an analogy. This business is the distribution of power and the distribution of power is often operated on a private business basis in the States particularly. I would agree with Comptroller Archer that in the case of the Hydro the Provincial Hydro system is the producer and you can buy directly from the producer.

I sit on the Hydro Commission and I can see certain values in having the local Commission. It participates in the local community activities. The only time we have ever had a series of complaints in East York Hydro was when there was a break at the Provincial Sub-station. We have had breaks in our own lines but the community is small and they were repaired so quickly that we never had serious complaints. The larger the area in which you have to make a complaint the more delay there is in having it attended to.

There is also a point that we are now

trying to bury the services in some parts of East York. This is something which Toronto is also doing as well as the local Hydro systems. This is a great improvement in the appearance of our streets and will be progressing simultaneously in various parts of the Metro area; whereas I fear if we had one Hydro system it would only be done in the core area where the assessment is highest and it would seem most important. The rest would not get it for some time. Perhaps this would be logical. It seems to me there is a purpose to be served in showing the people in various parts of the area the value of this. We are hoping to do some of it and we have the cooperation of our Hydro system in doing it in East York.

In connection with libraries the Chairman of our Library Board tells me that you asked him why we were buying services from Toronto. I am sure that he gave you a satisfactory answer, but here again I may say that this is something which we could provide as easily for ourselves as Leaside does but we bought the service from Toronto before we were able to do this and there has been a reluctance to terminate what was a very agreeable situation. We were on the verge of doing it four years ago when we decided to stay open on Wednesday and we were advised we couldn't because the hours in the Branch Libraries included closing on Wednesday afternoon. I don't know if it was all year around or in the summer. I know the Board simply exploded. We had Mr. Campbell up and they

said they could find staff for us. I would say there has been complete freedom of planning in every way. The East York system is an independent system and it has also received contributions from the local organizations in a way it would not have if it had been financed and managed centrally.

THE COMMISSIONER: I should say that when I asked that question it was not in any way intended to be a criticism. It was merely to ask why this was the situation.

MISS DAVIDSON: It is something that crops up. East York is an independent little community and it did not attempt to get libraries until it could afford them. It could not afford them until after the War and it began to grow a bit. It is a working class community ... you know the background of it. I would say I am very much against the two-level system. I am unalterably opposed. I am convinced it leads to extravagance where there is no need, where there is no natural division of duties. It is the old analogy of the manufacturer and the wholesaler.

Now in the case of roads there is a very clear differentiation between expressways and major highways, which are of interest to all Metro, and local roads. In the case of sewers and water mains there is a very clear differentiation but when you come to libraries and schools there is not this differentiation. I would say this would create more problems than it solved.

I could see that there would be a value

for a central cataloguing system. It might be provincial in character and it could be paid for at cost as a lot of the libraries subscribe to the Library of Congress cards. There is no reason we should not have such a service if Toronto wished to provide this. There is no reason why we couldn't buy it at cost plus whatever overhead is deemed proper. There would be value in having identical systems of cataloguing so people going from one library to another could look up books in the same way. There is a good library exchange. Most libraries will send books to each other and exchange them. This would be a facility if the cataloguing were identical and this could be done without setting up a second level. When you set up a second level its main job is to supervise the lower level and not to do things on its own and most discussions of the Central Library Board have involved re-distribution of funds and taking over of regional libraries and a general selection of locations. It is a general supervisory function and then you get into a state of competition. Everybody is out to get all he can for his own community. There are the difficulties that Comptroller Archer mentioned in a large Council.

I would say the larger the body the more competition there is between the members, whether it is Metro Council or Toronto City Council. You don't find the smaller communities having the protracted meetings and standing up and shaking their fists at each other and getting into long arguments as you do in

the larger Councils. Feelings run high and everybody is representing a different interest and trying to get what he can for it.

I would urge that we not have a two level system. I would sooner see, if we must have something like this, I would rather see an amalgamation of services if deemed it could not be done at the local level. Then I think it should be a Metro level unless you can divide it as neatly as you can.

We did not try dividing licensing or police. We would like to have a local police, we would like to have some of our own police who stayed in the community but you cannot have the police divided. It seems to me that there are very few services in which there is a logical and easy division.

THE COMMISSIONER: When you talk about a two level system being undesirable you mean only with respect to particular services?

MISS DAVIDSON: With respect to services where there are not two levels of service.

THE COMMISSIONER: You just brought something to my mind. You spoke about licensing. Have you any views on a division of the licensing authority so that licensing of local stores, for example, would be a local responsibility?

MISS DAVIDSON: No. We have had no trouble. I know this has been suggested. This has been suggested in some of the briefs. We have had no trouble with the Licensing Commission. They have cooperated in every way. They don't issue licences if

they are contrary to our zoning by-laws. They don't issue licences unless we would have issued them ourselves if the application were made to us.

I would like to see a change in the licensing legislation which would give more discretion to licensing authorities or to the Municipal Councils or someone because I know that there are situations -- this is, I suppose, a wild statement because I cannot prove it -- even what I have in the way of proof I could not give in public, but I know there are restaurants and stores where juvenile delinquency and crime are fostered and yet you cannot prove this. You cannot prove any connection with the owners and they continue to flourish and we cannot refuse them licences. I would like to see more discretionary power but I suppose it is dangerous to the rights of the individual.

THE COMMISSIONER: You have no criticism of the licensing alterations by the Licensing Commission?

MISS DAVIDSON: No. I see justice in some of the criticisms. Perhaps we should not have put in Magistrates. I know when I saw the criticisms of this I thought perhaps we had been wrong. I was on the Metro Executive when we made the recommendation. Perhaps it is not fair to have the same people serving in the two capacities. Perhaps there is difficulty in looking at it disinterestedly.

THE COMMISSIONER: You don't think licensing is a service which requires a two level

administration?

MISS DAVIDSON: No. I don't think it is susceptible of it really. Now, in connection with welfare I would like to reiterate what Comptroller Archer said about keeping the local level. I would like to tell you about experiments we have in East York. We have established a Visiting Homemakers Service for the aged which I think is the first community to do this and in the experimental phase we have managed to persuade the Visiting Homemakers to do this.

We have more than an ordinary number of older people. We have a friendly visiting programme. We have a number of special services for the aged, and this is a new one which we have introduced this year. A lot of our people have lived there for a long time, and I saw some figures of the Social Planning Council -- I haven't them with me -- but they showed the percentage of aged people in East York was higher than in the rest of the metropolitan area, and this had been done by the Research Department of the Social Planning Council and I think it would be right.

For this reason we have rather specialized in recreational services and welfare services for the aged, and we are now planning day-care services, and we have set aside $5,000.00 which is a fair item in East York Welfare Budget for a programme for work with young what you sometimes call hard-to-reach-youth, and it is a programme in which we are working with the Y.M.C.A. and with the churches and with the schools. It is quite an elaborate programme but I can't discuss it in public because if a thing like this is reported in the press it seems to lose its validity. The thing to do is to work quietly from the various angles, but we are attempting a community-wide attack on this.

We are the fifth lowest in Metro in juvenile delinquency, but we still have more of it than we like, and just as we have arranged to give loans for people for getting rid of termites, we are introducing a by-law, amendment to our zoning

by-law to make preparation of grounds against termites a prerequisite of new buildings. We feel that we can't stop them in all Metro, but we are going to have a darn good try at stamping them out in East York.

In Welfare I would praise highly the experiments that the City of Toronto is doing, and perhaps these experiments would go on even if we were amalgamated. But when you multiply the number of communities and you multiply the number of conscientious and fairly able people who are bending their minds to this problem so that you have more chance of more different kinds of experiments going on, and there is more chance of learning.

I will come back to this in connection with planning. I was a C.C.F'er in my youth. I don't know whether you know what it is. This was a radical group.

THE COMMISSIONER: I knew Mr. Woodsworth very well.

MISS DAVIDSON: I was converted under the ministry of Mr. Woodsworth.

THE COMMISSIONER: That is why I mentioned his name.

MISS DAVIDSON: It was more or less of a religious -- I have never been a member of the N.D.P. but they very kindly asked me to a discussion they were having on amalgamation last Saturday, and a representative of the City of Toronto said Toronto was not going to help pay for schools in the suburbs and have its children in old schools, so that this is the attitude.

This was agreed with by another representative from another municipality, and they agreed that the school costs had pyramided under the metropolitan system.

This, my first iconoclastic suggestion - I don't know whether I actually put it in words, but I believed it. I was a little frightened when I was doing my own brief because you know the more you think the more ideas come into your head and sometimes they frighten you yourself. But I would suggest that we go back to the suggestion of the Cummings Report that the individual school boards run their systems and that there be a Committee of Metropolitan Council which would do the redistribution of funds. I think this would serve the purpose of control on extravagances, and at the same time it would not be interfering with the real values of school boards which is their care of the educational facilities of the children in their area.

Different people do want different things, and every community thinks its school system is the best whether it is spending a lot of money or not. A good deal can be done without spending too much money if people really are interested in doing it.

The function of the Metropolitan School Board is really a financial function, and it has nothing to do with education. They have taken over more control of education than they should I think. There is a problem in connection with school attendance areas which would have to be solved, but this could be done by a Metro Committee.

If we have Metro after your report comes in, it will be a much larger council, and I think it would be continually growing as population grows because I am sure you won't set up a frozen system such as we have had which won't allow for improvement in representation from time to time as the area grows. I would see an education committee which would have outsiders as well as perhaps representatives from the educational system itself. Not necessarily from school boards, but perhaps from professional educators, some from the Universities and so on. They co-opt the public in the committees abroad.

THE COMMISSIONER: That is the English system.

MISS DAVIDSON: Yes, and I think there is great value. I can see such a committee assisting in the placing of schools, or at any rate preventing a bad placing of schools which is really all that would be necessary. If you simply state you couldn't build a new school within a certain distance of a local boundary when there was a school across the line within a certain distance which had vacant classrooms.

The criteria could be set down fairly simply, the administration for such a committee, and then you would have complete freedom that the local school boards claim they want, and of course I would hope that the financial system would be changed in any case so that there would be a more equitable arrangement.

I think that there is no reason to have amalgamation. You don't have to put the baby out with the bath water. There is no reason why we shouldn't retain the Metro system while getting rid of the inequitable -- nobody denies the present representation is inequitable, and that there is a wide variation in the tax rate although I don't object to some variation in the tax rate. I think this is reasonable so that people can have what they want and can pay for.

However, if there are certain things like schools then perhaps those are matters that I would think a rate of assistance could be worked out that could be equitable and would have relation to the number of people. Then you would have to hold everybody down to this or else you would have wealthy communities setting such a pace that everyone else would feel inferior.

Here again some form of equalization, some form of transfer of the tax on business and industry, as Mr. Archer referred to your comments in the Winnipeg Report.

I went even further. As a matter of fact I was terrified when this first occurred to me, and it wasn't until I saw something like it in the Winnipeg report that I had the courage to send it along. But it seems to me so logical because business is what needs Metropolitan services. Business is what needs expressways, to bring its employees in and take them home to their dormitories and bring its customers in and take them out, and it is what

needs various services which go to make a big city.

However, I would urge that you consider this. I don't know whether it is possible ever to go back. In connection with planning I have had the privilege of seeing Mr. Comay's brief, and I admire Mr. Comay very much. I was deeply impressed by his brief because it is so comprehensive and so statistical. But of course Mr. Comay is a scientist and I am a woman and we therefore see life somewhat differently and we plan from somewhat different angles.

We have recently been working on an official plan, and we have had a number of comments on it from various people, and I went over all these and it doesn't look as if we are any likelier to get the present project passed quickly than was the case with the earlier one in the book which Mr. Archer held up for you. I would like to quote one or two points. One is from our own official plan. There are two basic and opposing points of view concerning the character of the Metropolitan plan. The first / which seems to be the basis of this plan is that it should be a single, comprehensive master plan created as it were from the top down and the local municipalities to act as agents of Metro, implementing the Metro policy by use of standardized formulae. The second is that the plan should be created from the bottom up and be the sum of all its parts with individual official plans of the local municipalities which form the Federation of Metro. And that is these should have as much individuality and variation one from the other as is

possible, the Metropolitan plan being the cement that binds these aggregates together.

It goes on to say both these views are extreme and could lead to difficulties, but I think both of them should be considered, and any attempt to create a monolithic plan and impose it from above is bound to meet with difficulties.

Somebody mentioned Metro uniform traffic policy. A uniform traffic policy was brought up for revision last year, and the traffic -- what is it? I have forgotten the name of the organization -- the traffic conference I think it is that was considering it has finally dropped it because there was so much opposition to some of the matters, and I would like to read something from the Board of particular criticism of the new Metro plan which is germane to this same subject:

> "Adherence to specific development concepts such as the neighbourhood concepts should remain a matter of local option, but only to the extent that the requirements of the overall road system can be satisfactorily accommodated."

This is a quotation from the proposed new Metropolitan Plan: "the neighbourhood concepts should remain a matter of local option, but only to the extent that the requirements of the overall roady system can be satisfactorily accommodated."

"This we suggest" -- this is the Board of Trade -- "is a very severe policy without some further clarification what is actually meant by the use of the words overall road system. While we would not disagree that it is essential to develop a basic expressway and arterial road system, and that in order to do so it may be necessary to sacrifice certain local neighbourhood amenities, such an over-riding policy should not be permitted undue dominance, and certainly not be extended to roads which do not form an integral link in the expressway and arterial road system."

I did not have this at the time I submitted my brief, but it bears on what I said in my brief about Metro wanting to push traffic through regardless of where it goes, and push it on to the local roads to ease it on the local expressway and the local people want to take it all, and this is a conflict, and it is the balancing the same way as balancing of local and metropolitan interests that Mr. Archer referred to in connection with the Spadina Expressway.

To sum up, planning is really in my way of thinking a local activity. I do not consider the Metropolitan Planning Board a planning board at all. I don't know what it is. It is a hybrid sort of thing that is composed of people, men and women, who individually have great capacity and great public spirit, but what might be called the lay people are working part-time. They are not paid. Any study they give to this has to be done in their own time as a hobby. In most cases when they discuss these things they have

never seen them.

I know that in cases where I have seen them and have been able to refer to specific background of the problem, that I was the only one who had in most cases, and I have not been able I know although I really worked terribly hard I have not been able to get around and see most of the things that I had to vote on, and I have felt in many cases I didn't really know what I was voting on. I was being a rubber stamp for either the Planning Director or for some member of the council whose opinion I took on this particular local issue.

I think Mr. Comay pointed out in his own brief that very often the people who were most vocal and represented by the strongest political members found they were able to get things through in defiance of Metro opinion, whereas other people who were less ably represented had to submit. This is natural when the majority of the people have not seen the thing.

Remember, the people on the Metro Planning Board come from as far as Toronto Township and Ajax and Pickering and Richmond Hill, and the matter could be decided by the votes of these people, a matter of zoning in a Metro municipality can be decided by votes of people who have probably never seen the area at all.

THE COMMISSIONER: What you are critical of is the situation of the Metropolitan Planning Board?

MISS DAVIDSON: Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: You are not objecting to an overall plan of some kind?

MISS DAVIDSON: No. I am coming to that. I don't feel -- regional plans have great difficulty in getting through. Before we appointed Mr. Comay, we interviewed a man who was in the regional planning area out in British Columbia. He told us about his work, and we were greatly impressed by it, but we found he hadn't been able to get anything passed on.

I think regional planning must be imposed from above by the province, and as far as regional planning is concerned, the Metropolitan Corporation should present its brief to the Provincial Government about its limits -- the only way in which we will stop urban sprawl is by asking the Provincial Government to stop it. It is too much to expect that communities -- I should have brought the criticism of Toronto Township on the proposed plan.

THE COMMISSIONER: I have read it.

MISS DAVIDSON: Then you will note that it objected and very naturally because it looks at its own interest. Now, the only way in which you will ever get a green belt and ever get a limit -- otherwise you will have a city from Toronto to Hamilton -- the only way you will stop it is by regional planning.

THE COMMISSIONER: They tried a green belt in London, England, and did not restrict the sprawl. They just jumped over the belt.

MISS DAVIDSON: Well, it does at least leave other communities. At any rate, you have something more manageable I would think if it jumps over the belt. I think the only way to stop it permanently is

to buy up land. The only way to create a green belt, but there could be regulations, for instance, about sewage and other matters, and if a government had the courage to do it, they could say you can't have urbanization where you don't have certain facilities, and this would stop it, and in the interests of Canada perhaps it should be stopped. Maybe this can't be done. I don't know. Certainly it can't be done by the Metro Planning Board.

As far as planning the activities, expressways and water and so on, it is not by the Metro Planning Board. It is done by the Metro Planning Department, and it is implemented by the Metropolitan Council so that the Metropolitan Planning Department is giving instructions to the Metropolitan Council, and Mr. Comay said this quite frankly himself when we were discussing a certain change in zoning in East York.

We had a proposed District Plan. It was an area of special study, and we put in our report on it, and it was held up because it maintained an R-1 zoning which had been in existence in this area before our original plan went through. It had always been zoned R-1, and it had been queried at the time our plan went through Municipal Board, and the Municipal Board had upheld the contention of the residents and of the Council and of the Planning Board that it should be zoned R-1, and now the Metro Planning Board was prepared to hold up this plan unless we would rezone it R-2 because Metro wanted to put in public housing there, and it was suggested that the East York Council

was weak giving in to the pressures of the ratepayers, but nobody suggested this when we zoned it R-1 before against the objections of the owner and proposed apartment developers.

I said to Mr. Comay "Why should Metro be in any different position from any other developer?" He said "I feel my first duty is to Metro Council to implement its decisions", and I think this is his first duty, and it is the duty of the Metropolitan Planning Department so that you will then have, as I see it, a Metropolitan plan which would be skeletal as I think all Metropolitan services should be. It would be prepared by the Metropolitan Planning Department and it would have reference to the Metro services, and the Metro services do control to a very large extent the land use, but the land use plan is very vague. Very few people object to the land use plan because it is so vague, and the only area of problem that might arise would be in re-zoning, and in this case you would have the Metropolitan Council deciding on the recommendation of the Planning Commissioner whether or not it felt this re-zoning would interfere with Metropolitan needs; whether it would put too much traffic on Metropolitan roads or whether Metropolitan services couldn't supply it and so on.

THE COMMISSIONER: You would then need the planning area done geographically and restrict it to the plan of the Metropolitan Corporation proper, would you?

MISS DAVIDSON: Yes, I would have regional

planning done by the province.

THE COMMISSIONER: That is outside the Metropolitan area?

MISS DAVIDSON: Yes. Well, yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: You would have it done by the province whereas in the Metropolitan area it would be done by a Metropolitan Department?

MISS DAVIDSON: Possibly a Planning Committee, reporting through a Planning Committee or reporting through the executive on matters which affected the skeletal plan which would be a plan having relation to Metropolitan services.

The actual day-to-day zoning -- the zoning was left I am sure to the local municipalities because it is a matter that requires intimate knowledge. We do a lot of our re-zoning. We have tried not to have too much particularity about our zoning because it is very difficult to construct a zoning by-law so that you would be sure to have good development, whereas if you re-zone in an area which is already more or less decided, it is pretty clear. We did originally have plans as to where we wanted certain types of things, and these were not incorporated in our final plan. It is like the Metro draft official plan which hasn't passed, but it is used. We know where we want apartments and commercial development, and if people apply to build there, they will be re-zoned on site plan, and then we have some control and we can provide proper screening to shut them off from adjacent residential areas and so on.

And we can make sure that there are extra channels in the road if necessary to see that the traffic may merge reasonably, and we can do all these things if we have a special site plan or re-zoning.

I may say in connection with planning, local planning boards also have introduced a number of ideas. East York's bonus scheme for the density of apartment buildings has been commented on. I understand Toronto is considering using it now, and several municipalities have written and asked us about it. North York had an interesting plan for sliding scale of traffic, parking provisions according to the size and position of an apartment building or office building, and we are hoping to get those and see if they have help for us. Here again you have a wide variety of minds focused on municipal problems, and this I think is good.

I am coming to the end. I am very nearly through. Someone said this morning that uniformity meant high standards. Now, I don't think it necessarily does. Uniformity is very attractive to a planner. Uniformity is very attractive to an administrator. It is very attractive to a theorist.

THE COMMISSIONER: It sounds very simple and neat.

MISS DAVIDSON: Yes, it does, but I was recently at a conference, and this is also since I have put in my brief. The Canadian Association for Adult Education on April 25 and 26 held a conference on learning to live in the city, and I want to quote one or two things from the introductory remarks at that conference.

During that conference we broke up into workshops, and one man from Don Mills was widely quoted in the papers, and I suppose you have been reading our papers and perhaps noticed this. He said: "Don Mills was a collection of cakeboxes in which the unhappy cakewives led a disjointed sort of life."

THE COMMISSIONER: I even saw him repeat that on television.

MISS DAVIDSON: Well, he believed it, and so do I because I think there is nothing more deadly than uniformity. As a matter of fact I think we have to review our whole picture of public housing. I don't know that we can pick up anything from the old country or even from United States and bring it into Canada and think it will work. We are always behind everyone else, and by the time we catch up perhaps by this time they have found their mistakes. I think we did this with the junior high schools, and I was one of the ones responsible for introducing them here.

I don't think Canadians want or will live in the sort of public housing and certainly they won't live next to it happily. I was over on the Ontario Municipal Work Study tour two years ago. We were in Holland, and we were talking about private enterprise. It seemed to us that the Government did most of the building. They own all the land. Of course they reclaim it from the sea, and they said they allowed private enterprise to build some homes but they controlled them. I said "How do they do it? We would so love to have architectural control.", and they showed us an

area where they had this control, and every house was identical with every other house. They had apparently given them a plan and said "Build them according to this plan."

THE COMMISSIONER: That is uniformity.

MISS DAVIDSON: That is uniformity. I said "Oh, well, this is what we want to avoid. We don't have to supervise private enterprise in order to get this at home. This is what private enterprise does for us at home. They would never use two plans where one would do." So evidently there is a different feeling there. I don't think anybody wants to go into a street like this if they can get onto something different. After all we are children of pioneers. We are the descendants of people who weren't satisfied with things as they were; people who wanted to own something. The first thing every newcomer does -- I am sorry, I am shaking my fist at you.

THE COMMISSIONER: That is what you said nobody would dare do to you, at least at East York Council.

MISS DAVIDSON: Oh, did I? They just stab me in the back. They don't shake their fists at me. The people, the immigrants who come into Canada now, the newcomers, the first thing they want is to buy a home; buy a home for themselves and own some land. They will pack in three or four families, and as soon as they get a little money they will move out and get their own home. This is what Canadians want, but they also have a certain conservativeness so you can't talk

of the United States.

Marjory King says we are studying how we can learn to use the city more effectively as a place in which to live and grow and develop as human beings.

Then Mr. Lawson who is an Old Country planner as distinct from an American planner -- there is a complete difference of outlook between Old Country planners and American planners -- he says it is really the life in the city, the activity that takes place. These are the real things in the city, and fundamentally we are concerned with the citizens, the people who take part in all these different activities as well as in the activity itself.

Then we go on to Mr. -- I must look up his name because it is a beautiful French name. He is an adult educator with a Firm of Planning Consultants in Montreal. Guy Beaugrand-Champagne. You perhaps know him.

THE COMMISSIONER: I know his name very well. I don't know him.

MISS DAVIDSON: He speaks of the various centres of decision in the City rather reminiscent of what Mr. Archer said on the same subject where five or six people make the decision, and the more these are spread the more people are involved in the decision-making. He says "We have centres of decision at the city level and at the financial level " He is speaking about Quebec and Montreal particularly. "but not at the regional nor at the precinct level."

The greater part of his speech dealt with

the need for a decision-making body at the precinct level. He speaks of life in the city being confusing and baffling and decisions affecting the life of the citizens are taken by authority under pressure of certain interests which have many forces at play, and he is not able to reach the level at which decisions are made. He feels he is completely out of touch with them. He speaks of the uniform agglomerations which we get in the city and how these are not normal, and he ends up, or at least I end up: "This brings the basic problem, the computer, the organizing device, will it take command of us or will we take command of it? How can we introduce the subjective data into the system of objective data on the basis of which decisions are taken?"

Now, to me the computers and the research people and the objective studies are made at the Metropolitan level, and the subjective needs of the people are introduced at the local level. To me this is quite important, and the longer I have studied it the surer I am that it is important.

I don't know whether you have read the book by Ayn Rand called The Anthem. You probably know The Fountainhead. In Anthem she portrays a time when everybody was numbered. Mr. Archer spoke about numbering districts. This to me is a hideous nightmare. The hero had never heard the word "I" or "you". He always said "we" and "they".

He fell in love with a young woman who also had a number and he said: "They". He would speak of her as "They" and when he finally discovered, rediscovered this stereotype and standard area of the future, the significance of the individual and "I" and "You" he felt that a complete new world had opened up before him. It is this world of "I and You" of which I don't want to deprive the people in Metropolitan Toronto and above all I don't want to have to sit any oftener than I already have to in a Council in which people quarrel and talk for the newspapers and television and in which the public is not really a participating factor in decisions.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much, Miss Davidson.

MISS DAVIDSON: Thank you for listening to me patiently.

THE COMMISSIONER: I want to congratulate you on the statement which you wrote so well accompanying your brief, the long document which I read with great interest.

MISS DAVIDSON: I didn't expect you would read it but it represented an effort to work through. When I started I didn't know I was going to have to do it but eventually I did have to in order to understand what I thought and why I thought it.

THE COMMISSIONER: I read it with great interest.

MISS DIVIDSON: Thank you very much.

THE COMMISSIONER: Now, Mrs. Gell, do

you want to go ahead now?

MRS. GELL: I will only be a few minutes, Mr. Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: I notice the reporters are starving but maybe it will do them some good!

MRS. GELL: My problem is I am a member of the Conservation Authority and I have a meeting in Woodbridge that I must attend.

SUBMISSION OF MRS. FLORENCE GELL, DEPUTY REEVE OF THE TOWNSHIP OF YORK

MRS. GELL: Dr. Goldenberg, at one time this morning I felt that I should have a party of colleagues from the Township of York sitting with me or I should have endeavoured to augment the York Township brief in some way. I have submitted this brief as a Municipal Councillor with some years of experience and with some thoughts that I had on the need of closeness of Municipal Councils to their people and the brief is entirely on that basis.

I have had a very special interest in municipal affairs. I was for a good many years a school trustee and I must phone True and tell her she and I were trustees together and I can remember the many times True Davidson endeavoured to tell me the merits of the Junior High School system and why East York was having it. It was a bit refreshing to hear her say she has decided they should not have it.

I want to thank you for the opportunity of adding a few thoughts to this submission. After you have read a document like this, Dr. Goldenberg, you think of things you should have said and how much better you could have said them if you had thought them out a little bit more.

On page 1 of my brief I endeavoured to make it clear that I am wholly in accord with the submission of the Corporation of the Township of York but I felt I wanted to try and stress a few things, as I said before, the necessity of a Municipal Council

being closer to the people which they represent and if an area becomes too large of course this is lost.

The York brief was completely based around a six borough system and I believe one of the main advantages of a six borough system is that it retains local municipalities capable of providing adequate representation to the people of an area.

I represent a Ward of some 13,000 voters, a Ward known at times to cast a 48% vote at election time so you can see they are interested in their Township and their workings. After each election I have found a new copy of the voters list of the Ward and as the year goes on I mark in this book the people who call by telephone and communicate with me and by the time the next election comes around I find myself with perhaps 2,000 ticks in the book. Regardless of these calls, and numerous as they may be, I have received many valued comments, criticisms and suggestions from the ordinary home owner and they have been the basis of good by-laws and in some cases legislation, which has come from the ordinary resident of a small municipality who has an interest in where he lives and how it is run.

I think that you will agree, Mr. Commissioner, that many of the ideas on how to amend the Ontario Municipal Act that is being studied now by a Committee in this building have come from individual people, Municipal Councillors, Commissioners, members of this type, because through their experience with the general public they have knowledge of the need

of the people and have been found worthy of the consideration of the important Legislation Committee that is now sitting.

I have two copies of the proposed amendment to the Municipal Act and in reading them I was left with the feeling that it was the people that they were studying. There is the case of welfare and housing and this type of thing that have been brought to their attention and in the local municipalities there is need for this type of thing to be closer to the people and a proper understanding of the local needs and the problems becomes absolutely impossible when the area becomes too large.

I deal with a division of authority on page 5 and in this division I would like to add that I believe each borough should have a Board of Control. Now the powers given to a Board of Control under the Municipal Act while they do not appear to have much in scope on paper they are of such a nature that a great deal of detail work in the running of a municipality would be lifted from the shoulders of Councillors thus giving much more time to spend in the respective Wards and study the needs. You would think in a Township the age of York with its complete Departments built up over the years in a very smooth running organization, together with a group of exceptionally well experienced senior officials, that the work load in our municipality would become lessened and after eleven years I can safely say that this is not so. I think the advent of Metro when of

TRANSCRIPTION BY ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD. TORONTO, ONTARIO MEMBER

necessity our Reeves have had to be away from their desks a great deal of time and with the organization of the municipal budget becoming highly technical each year, with the financing of our debentures, with the modern programme of dealing with welfare cases, the problems of redevelopment, to cite only a few, has certainly added a great deal more work to the members of Council.

I point out that it is important that a member of Council be aware of his local problems and I feel that I can be justly proud by saying over the years York has proven that a municipality of the size that it is has known of the needs of its people and many times it has met those needs before they became too evident. The low cost housing for our senior citizens was one of these. York's age brought with it a great many older people who were railroaders and this type of thing and retired and it became apparent that an apartment for a person living on an old age pension was going to be an necessity, hence the York Township Housing Company Limited with its individual apartments that are rented at $29.00 a month gives security and dignity to our aged.

The education and care of the retarded child was recognized in 1950 and certainly no one was more grateful to the Provincial Government than those people who still run our school for the recognition of the government in the last amendment to the Schools Administration Act, where the people who

commenced and still operate the school will have some of the financial burden liften from the York Township Retarded School.

We have found that the inclement weather in southern Ontario doesn't give too much outdoor skating and so York was one of the first to build three outdoor natural ice rinks for the people. We recognized the need of pools and the first Olympic outdoor swimming pool in Metropolitan Toronto was built. We recognized many years ago the need of an ambulance service within our municipalities after a very distressing incident, a traffic accident. York Township operates through its Fire Department an ambulance for traffic cases and the officer on the scene radios the station and the ambulance is discharged to the scene and in many cases we have been able to divert serious results.

We have found too that we must look into the mental health picture and with the Province of Ontario asking us to run a pilot project we have a mental health clinic that we have operated for a good many years.

We have found too the need of library services and long before we had our three regional libraries we had a mobile for our library and even with the large library that we have now we have not been able to replace the mobile because it is used too much.

The need for the stabilization of Hydro rates was answered in 1940 by the Township of York

whose Council resolved itself into a Hydro committee and for both financial benefit and for the benefit of our Hydro consumers operated our Hydro system, which is now valued at about 7 million dollars. York is proud of the fact that we have the lowest rate in Metropolitan Toronto. We converted our power to 60 cycle and relit the streets with the most modern lighting we could find at no cost to the consumer. Now there are three new Hydro sub-stations erected in 1963 to take care of the peak loads and we are turning to underground wiring and in some apartment developments the first underground cables will be laid.

We have found that the Hydro Committee, which consists of members of Council, does a very fine job in this public utility. We have made representations to the Ontario Hydro for reduction of rates and we have been refused that in order to stabilize the rates across the Province.

The same thing applies to our Water Department. In certain sections of the Township of York we have some very large homes where the water rates were charged by the tap method and this became a little unfair to the person who paid this. We have completely metered our municipality with the exception of about 200 homes that it is impossible to do, so our customers, our water customers pay for just exactly what they use. This is run by Council and we are very grateful. We make money out of the Water Department and put it into the general tax rate to help reduce the load.

Regardless, Mr. Commissioner, of the awareness of the needs of a Councillor to the problems of the people which he represents nothing can be accomplished without an efficiency in administration and on page 7 I endeavour to outline what the six borough system would mean in the efficiency of administration. The provision of so many municipal services is by way of direct contact with the individual taxpayer and if these Departments become too large, which has been proved time and time again, the individual problems of the taxpayer get lost along the way.

The smaller the Department the closer rein can be held on the efficiency of the workmen and certainly on municipal costs, when you consider that every taxpayer and every resident of an area is a watch dog of the roads, the garbage, and the sewer departments, every member of Council must have his finger right on the pulse of these Departments. There is nothing more irritating to a resident than to have a sloppy crew dig up his front lawn and then he endeavours to phone the municipal building and gets shifted from one Department to another before he can be satisfied.

To keep a high efficiency in the quality of the work performed and keep municipal costs at a minimum the revision of areas small enough to be correctly administered is very important.

That is all I have to say. Thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER: In your brief you say something about taxation. You say on page 8, referring to the inequalities in taxation resulting from the favourable assessment position of some of the smaller municipalities, you say the six borough plan would remove these inequalities and each borough would have a similar tax base. Do you think that a six borough system would improve the Scarborough situation, which has been drawn to my attention as the most serious one in terms of inequality?

MRS. GELL: Well, I believe, Dr. Goldenberg, in the York brief. I perhaps have left a word out here. It was stressed the quality of assessment as well as the quantity of it. In the Table presented by York it proves this to be so. We don't say that there should be an equalization of assessment as a whole but rather it should be looked at as the quality of assessment.

I just want to close by saying I have been a resident of York since 1932 and many people say to me: "How did you ever get into politics?" I say that my first tax bill sent me down to the municipal offices of the Township of York to find out why I should have to pay this amount of money when I didn't know what it was for. I have been always vitally interested in my community and very proud of York. The advent of Metropolitan Toronto certainly solved a great many of the problems of all the municipalities but some complex problems have raised their heads again and we are grateful to the Government

for appointing a Royal Commission to help us with these problems. No one envies you your job, Mr. Commissioner, but we all know that when the findings of the Royal Commission on Metropolitan Toronto are published that it will take its rightful place in the statutes of this great area of the Province of Ontario and may I wish you well.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. Mr. Farrow, do you want to go ahead? I was going to sit this afternoon if I had more than one brief but I have only your brief left.

MR. FARROW: I would be happy to proceed.

SUBMISSION OF MR. E. H. FARROW

MR. FARROW: As you pointed out yourself, sir, my brief is very short. I am wondering if there are any questions on the brief itself?

THE COMMISSIONER: I have no particular questions. I have read it and I have underlined some things. Perhaps you would like to highlight it.

MR. FARROW: Thank you, sir.

THE COMMISSIONER: You may go ahead and do so.

MR. FARROW: One of the points that I was mentioning in my brief was the power of the City of Toronto and of the pro-amalgamation Press, which played up as Gospel and as reason for amalgamation any minor thing that came out and any minor utterance of a member of City Council.

As an illustration of this I have taken two items that are very dear to my heart and I have possibly felt them more than anything else.

One is the Thistletown Project. Quite a few years ago the Township of Etobicoke assisted a Provincial-Federal Government partnership to obtain a large acreage of land in the northern section of the Township with a view to establishing a public low cost low rental housing department. At this time certain verbal agreements were made on the basis of which Etobicoke based its plans for such time as the ultimate development might take place. We had no objection to taking over the burden from the City of Toronto, which in effect we were doing at that

time, because we realized that the people who would be in need of this type of housing accommodation could not obtain it within the City proper without a large redevelopment plan and therefore they had to come out into the then more or less open suburbs in order to establish something.

When the development of the municipality began to approach the area in question more and more negotiations took place. The only surviving member of the original planning group was our own Industrial Commissioner, Mr. Eckersley. Various other interested Departments had changed hands. Comment has been made about the various changes in Department heads in both the Ontario and Federal government in the last several years. Now, neither the Provincial nor the Federal interested Departments had any records of the original agreements and therefore denied any responsibility under the agreement. Etobicoke representatives were advised that the senior partners would not honour the agreement and further negotiations took place about this time, apparently completely ignoring all the background.

A lady alderman of the City of Toronto stated publicly that Etobicoke was holding up the low cost housing so badly needed by so many unfortunate people and the cry was immediately taken up by the Toronto Daily Star and the other papers and the reporting was so completely biased that it might have been an outright lie.

The newspaper readers make the mistake

of accepting the newspaper propaganda as outright Gospel.

A weaker Council might have succumbed and left this to the future inhabitants of the area. I am speaking of services of a recreational nature, which this type of development by its very composition requires more than any other area. By that I might point out that most of the people who would be located in a development of that type would have to mainly rely on public transportation. There are few automobiles and there would be a relative congestion and therefore they should have and are entitled to possibly more and closer community facilities in the nature of rinks, swimming pools, tennis courts and institutional uses than in another area.

By the same token we are faced as a growing municipality with the problem of providing for our own residents over a long term plan in order not to affect our mill rate to too great an extent.

The other criticism which we had in this particular point was the fact that we felt the area was too large and no matter how hard you try to integrate with your existing areas one given area as a low rental development takes unto itself a sort of stigma which the people within that area carry with them, for instance in their applications for employment and so on and so forth. All things being equal a person's residence quite often makes a difference in the various personnel departments.

In view of studies we have made in other areas, we were attempting to convice the Federal and Provincial partners that if it were possible to re-arrange some of this area, possibly spread it to other sections of the municipality where they could be better integrated with the other areas, that the people who were going to live there were eventually going to receive some benefit without the stigma being attached to them of living in a public housing development.

I think the Etobicoke Council held firm to a man that the rights and expectations of the people living in the area must in some way be protected. After a meeting of the whole of Council with P. H. Brady, Secretary of the Metropolitan Housing Authority, and Dr. A. Rose, Professor of Social Work at the University of Toronto at which meeting all possible facets affecting future inhabitants were discussed, Dr. Rose said in effect, and I am not quoting; I am trying to put into his words my interpretation of what he said: Prior to this meeting what I knew of Etobicoke's feeling in this matter was only what I read in the newspaper. They didn't give you a very good name. From what I have heard discussed to-night, I now realize you have given serious and grave study to the needs and social requirements of the future residents of the Thistletown project, and all your actions which have been so maligned have been seriously taken for the benefit and protection of future residents.

I am attempting to illustrate the type of power and public pressure which is brought to

bear because this particular item was used as an argument for amalgamation by, I believe, every one of the Toronto newspapers. The Toronto Star especially came out with some very unfair editorials, and we have to realize that the Provincial Government is possibly more affected by public pressure than our municipal officials. They, to a certain extent, bear our destiny in their hands.

THE COMMISSIONER: Would you suggest a new metropolitan department of censorship of newspapers?

MR. FARROW: Maybe you got something there, sir. No, I don't believe in censorship, but I do believe that even editorial policy should attempt to show at least, if it shows one side of the story, it should show a little bit of the other.

THE COMMISSIONER: In any event, I am not going to recommend censorship.

MR. FARROW: No. Another item which I might use in explanation of that point, sir, is relative to the Fire Department. After the fire which recently razed the Palace Pier in the mouth of the Humber River, at least one and possibly two or three City of Toronto Controllers made remarks to the effect that had amalgamation been in force, and had their new fire boat been constructed, the complete loss would not have developed. This was immediately taken up by the Toronto Star, and ending up as a big thing in favour of amalgamation.

What they did not report, to my knowledge, was the true matter of attack of the fire by the firemen, or the fact that the number of British

Thermal Units produced by the fire; had the entire Toronto Fire Department responded, it would have been of no avail whatsoever.

Insofar as the fire boat, it was still on the drawing board. The time factor of its arrival would have been of too long a duration as the roof was caving in over the entire structure within forty-five minutes of the original delayed alarm.

As a comparison, we might look at a similar fire which happened one year ago on a similar cold night in the City of Toronto. The fire at the Hamstead Restaurant in the Exhibition detected in the early stages, was surrounded by roads, a goodly set of fire hydrants, and with a fire fighting force of eighty men and seventeen pieces of equipment, this building and its attachments were all a total loss. Again the hose streams were not absorbing the number of B.T.U. that the flames were producing.

Relative to the Palace Pier fire I might say it was suggested by the newspapers the Township was left without any protection through this fire. Now, due to an excellent mutual aid agreement with the Lakeshore areas, our area was still manned with eight pumpers -- ten units in all.

Relative to the main brief itself, in my brief I have attempted to deal with the basic democratic principles rather than economics. The democratic principles which form the pattern of our way of living. These have no economic dollar value. In fact they have a value far in excess of any dollar

value we may try to place on our method of government.

The right to self-government has been handed down from generation to generation, and we received as a heritage a high form of freedom which evolved after centuries of progress from our British and French ancestors, and latterly from our ancestors on our own Canadian soil. Is it any wonder, then, when this freedom is threatened in the municipal field, that we, in the municipalities other than Toronto proper, should be gravely concerned over that freedom which, until this Commission makes a report which may or may not be acted upon, may be threatened?

While I have said my brief does not, in effect, deal with economics, in order to explain a point, I would like your permission to digress briefly. And while doing so, I would like to quote a very short paragraph from the Gathercole report.

"If the level of spending in Toronto was adopted in all municipalities in the Metropolitan Area, the cost of general services would rise by 20 to 25 per cent, and of public and secondary school education by about 16 per cent."

"The Gathercole report also said that statistics on expenditures and assessment suggest that the City of Toronto would gain in any amalgamation or partial consolidation of the area municipalities through diverting some of this burden of higher expenditures to the other municipalities."

Now here is my purpose in making reference to the economics of the Gathercole Report: -

This is a studied, unprejudiced report wherein the benefit of a thorough study of the economic factors was made. On the other hand, as a practicing Chartered Accountant, I am also aware that with the volume of figures and statistics available from the various municipalities, I could provide a very convincing picture in any direction you wish to point. And once I begin heading in a given direction, I can assure you that the volume of evidence which develops becomes quite convincing to the author. I might mention I can take any one of the points raised by Controller Lamport and argue much more convincingly in the other direction.

The point that I am attempting to make to the Commission is that a number of experts have authored briefs with possibly widely varying trends, all of which are both realistic and convincing. And I sincerely hope that the various municipalities will have an opportunity to study these various briefs in the future, with a view to seeing themselves as others see them, and using the benefit they may derive from the contents of such briefs for the greater glory and benefit of their own residents. At the same time, I feel that the action of this Commission after the termination of these hearings will hold equal import with the Durham Report which brought a form of self-government after the rebellion of 1837, and because of that, any recommendations which come forth must be based, for the most part, on a theory derived from our democratic thinking or teachings

rather than plain economics.

I feel, personally, that an amalgamated Metropolitan Toronto area would result in a bloc of power more powerful than that of the Province of Ontario. And that is not how our nation has been developed.

I further feel, Gentlemen, that when an issue such as the one before you is being considered, its import is too great to consider it on the basis of dollars and cents; but I realize also that no one realizes the gravity so much as the men on whom this tremendous responsibility rests.

I apologize, Sir, if I have not been able to add as much food for thought as have some of my predecessors. But I have said what is in my heart, and what, I believe, is in the hearts of many others. Thank you for your attention.

THE COMMISSIONER: I am interested in a chartered accountant telling me what to think in terms of dollars and cents.

MR. FARROW: After eight years in the municipal field, sir, you begin to question figures somewhat closely.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. Farrow. We shall now adjourn to to-morrow morning at ten o'clock.

---Adjourned until 10:00 A.M. June 10, 1964.

ROYAL COMMISSION

ON

METROPOLITAN TORONTO

HEARINGS

HELD AT

PARLIAMENT BLDGS.
TORONTO

VOLUME No.: 18

DATE: JUNE 10, 1964

OFFICIAL REPORTERS
ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.
BOARD OF TRADE BLDG.
11 ADELAIDE ST. W.
TORONTO

364-5865 364-7383

TRANSCRIPTION BY MEMBER
ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.
TORONTO, ONTARIO

ROYAL COMMISSION ON METROPOLITAN TORONTO

Hearings of the Royal Commission on Metropolitan Toronto, held at the Parliament Buildings, Toronto, Ontario, on Wednesday, the 10th day of June, 1964 commencing at 10 A.M. et seq.

PRESENT:

H. CARL GOLDENBERG, O.B.E., Q.C.	- Commissioner
F. H. FINNIS	- Secretary
L. FELDMAN	- Research Officer
T. PLUNKETT	- Municipal Consultant

- - - - -

ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.
TORONTO, ONTARIO

INDEX TO SUBMISSIONS

DESCRIPTION	PAGES
MR. JOHN D. PARKER	1602 - 1611
COUNCILLOR N. MAUGHAN, EAST YORK	1612 - 1619
COUNCILLOR L. H. SAUNDERS	1620 - 1633
MR. J. C. VAN ESTERIK	1634 - 1641
MRS. MARY L. AXELSON	1642 - 1650
MRS. KATHLEEN JAMES	1651 - 1656
MR. DALTON J. LITTLE	1657 - 1670

---UPON RESUMING AT 10:00 A.M., JUNE 10th, 1964.

SUBMISSION OF MR. JOHN D. PARKER

THE COMMISSIONER: Is Mr. John D. Parker here?

MR. PARKER: Good morning, Mr. Commissioner.

I wish to thank you most sincerely Mr. Commissioner for this opportunity of appearing before you.

Because I believe your findings and recommendations will undoubtedly establish the pattern of municipal government in the Metropolitan Toronto area for future years, just as Dr. Cumming's findings were reflected in Bill 80 of 1953, I am most anxious to assist you in any manner possible.

In my covering letter I pointed out that as a member of the first Metropolitan School Board in 1953 and a school trustee for the past 15 years I have a very great interest in the education of the children of the entire Metro area, indeed anywhere and everywhere.

From what has been appearing in the papers regarding the "equality" of educational opportunities being provided by the various metro boards I would like to point out that each and every board is now providing not only a good basic education for all children, but one of which it can be proud, and, which if compared with the education provided children in other municipalities - in the province - the Dominion or elsewhere will redound to its credit. What is

causing concern is the inequitable tax burden being borne by some taxpayers in certain municipalities due to insufficient assessments to provide an adequate tax base, thereby requiring a substantially greater dollar outlay by them to provide the same educational features being provided by other Boards.

From the submissions made to date as far as Boards of Education are concerned the previous problem and teachers salaries plus optimum size and local autonomy seem to be the matters that make some modifications, if not major changes, resulting in either a Borough System or amalgamation, desirable if not necessary.

Because of the great financial benefits derived and the tremendous accomplishments achieved in the educational field under the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act 1953, or Bill 80, all must acknowledge that actually Metro is a success. Certainly great thanks are due Dr. Cummings for his imagination, insight and foresight but most of all for his courage in proposing something absolutely new and different in municipal government that was sound, practical and which met the pressing needs of the time. Indeed it is this very success and the knowledge that we must move forward if we are to progress that my proposals are submitted.

With regard to salaries it has been claimed that centralized control of salary schedules would avoid increased salaries and raiding of teachers and thus resolve one of the serious problems facing Boards of Education today. The movement of staff

(raiding) from one Metro Board to another is less than the employment turnover in any industry. Inquiry has determined the movements of experienced staff is practically 100% because of opportunities for advancement to a Headship, Vice Principalship, Principalship or else for purely personal or family reasons. At the moment this matter is completely out of focus for the fact is that the basic problem is a shortage of teachers. Had it not been for the courage and foresight of certain Boards to increase salaries appreciably the teaching profession would have been in a most unfavourable position with the result that the calibre of staff would be inferior to what it is today, for many recent graduates from Universities and persons from business and industry have entered teaching because of the higher salary schedules now in effect. As long as the shortage of teachers exist competition will remain and the latest threat to Metro comes not from within but from other provincial cities and areas who feel they are not attracting either the quantity or quality of teachers they desire. At any rate until we resolve the shortage problem competition will continue in one form or another.

During your hearings much material has been submitted regarding the desirable size of an educational system. From New York, Boston, Chicago, Detroit, etc. and from the report of the "Royal Commission on local government in Greater London 1957 - 1960" a consensus of opinion suggesting a size from 100,000 to 300,000 population has emerged. However we

have evidence on our very doorstep which indicates the optimum can be increased to at least 500,000. I refer to the excellent educational system operated by the Toronto Board of Education. In fact I not only regard it as evidence of a feasible maximum but I see it also as the outside desirable limit for any system. I am very definitely afraid that rigidity and bureaucratic tendencies may quickly result if it were to become any larger than it now is.

With regard to the limited roll suggested in some proposals for local trustees or committees I would point out that the vitality of an educational system depends in large measures on the powers of those administering education. Without financial control planning could be frustrating and ineffectual. An Advisory Committee without powers of finance, planning and administration would be so impotent that not only would little be achieved, but men and women of the calibre who would give a system vitality through their resourcefulness, their initiative and their imagination would not commit themselves to public service in such a perfunctory role.

With regard to my brief I recognize on page one that the principal that 'The combined resources of the entire area are to be made available to support education and to overcome the most serious inequities ----- where some parts of the area do not have the financial resources required to provide the--- essentials in the way of education while others, because of the concentration of non-residential assess-

ment --- have taxable resources which in comparison are much greater than their needs" was beginning not to be completely acceptable to certain paying boards without the introduction of some financial control over the practices and operations of the receiving boards. Also that other Boards were becoming dissatisfied with how the abrogation of the principal of "representation by population" which was permitting too loud a voice for certain Boards to the disadvantage of Boards representing much larger communities.

On page two I refer to the two studies made by the Metropolitan School Board both of which were prompted by a dissatisfaction with how the Metropolitan School Board was functioning and a realization that some solution must be found or developed that would resolve the dilemma which faced the Boards who had an inadequate tax base.

In essence it is on this page that my most significant suggestions are made, namely:

That it is regrettable that, to so many, the financial aspects are emphasized and considered whereas the "philosophy of education" provided determines its real value to children. Buildings, equipment and other facilities are of no avail without dedicated, competent and qualified teachers to instruct, inspire and encourage the pupils - and this type of "service" should surely never have to compete with such "services" as water, pavement and sewers. For this and the other reasons submitted I maintain education should be divorced from its tie with Councils - Municipal, Metro or any kind

TRANSCRIPTION BY MEMBER
ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.
TORONTO, ONTARIO

you may recommend. The manner in which we now operate has nullified previous procedures and placed the safeguards against over spending in the hands of the Department of Education, the Municipal Board and the Metro Board of Education.

Under a Borough system for education this new procedure could still be followed. What is more under these circumstances a Borough system for education could be established even if Council and other Municipal Boards were amalgamated. While such an idea may seem novel it is not only practical but permits optimum size educational systems to be established.

Also if Boroughs along the lines suggested by me are established adequate assessment tax bases will be provided. This feature is something overlooked by all other Borough proposals as they leave Scarborough intact. Scarborough's tax base is the reason inequities exist and any proposal which overlooks this need fails to resolve one of the major reasons for considering any change at all.

On pages three and four I point out from an educational standpoint the benefits that would be derived if school systems within a range of 100,000 to 500,000 population were established and the dangers if larger.

It is the future needs which have in large measure prompted an examination of our present educational organization. It is imperative those future needs be met on a basis designed to continue the present high standards and not to jeopardize what we

now have to solve what may in fact be short term conditions - that is - a shortage of qualified teachers. Equality of education requires careful definition. There are certain basic requirements to insure a reasonable standard, but absolute equality is neither possible nor desirable, and attempts to attain it could well undermine the total effectiveness of an educational system in as large an area as Metropolitan Toronto.

Finally on pages five and six I delineate the 5 Boroughs which I recommend with the reasons therefor. I also propose amendments to present legislation which would solve our major financial problems particularly should my point regarding non-residential assessment be considered valid with respect to the entitlement thereto by suburban dormitory areas.

Thank you very much.

I must admit that frankly my consideration of all this problem has led me to believe that where practical and feasible as far as geographical and population density is concerned that in the interests of the children the best educational system could be provided, provided it is based on a system that has a minimum of 80 to 100,000 population.

I would conclude by stating the benefits of a borough system are that it does not debar amalgamation, should it prove ultimately desirable. It permits a smaller unit plan to be tried and it permits the educational planning to be nearer the grass roots level. It permits unity with diversity in a community, without uniformity. It permits the

choice of educational programmes and checks bureaucratic tendencies which are inherent in a large monolithic organization.

THE COMMISSIONER: I am interested in all the suggestions you have made but I am particularly interested in your suggestion that school taxes should be collected directly by the School Boards. Do you see any complication there if that were done?

MR. PARKER: Basically in my thinking the same facilities would be utilized and I do not see any difficulty. At the present time the division of the two taxes is clearly established. I do not see that it would present any insurmountable obstacle nor a particularly expensive one for two separate tax bills to be printed and distributed.

THE COMMISSIONER: You feel it would not only show the taxpayer to whom he is paying the particular levy but it would make for peace between the Municipal Council and the School Board?

MR. PARKER: Frankly I feel as I mentioned about Committees -- I can understand the frustrated feeling Councils have when presented with a budget which in the final analysis has been established that they must in the final result levy. I think it must be frustrating for them and it provides a bunch of sitting ducks for political fun to be indulged in. They are shooting at something that in no way affects them. I am more concerned about how frustrating it must be for them. Secondly, I think that

with reference again to the capital procedures in the past if a Council did not see eye to eye with a School Board it could disagree and a plebescite was taken. As I understand it if the Council would not agree today in the Metro area why an appeal would be made to the Municipal Board. Once again the Council finds itself in a position where it can go on record without any great responsibility but it nevertheless is, in my opinion, further frustrated so that they will not be stigmatized, as I pointed out, with the blame for the tax dollar that has to be raised.

I think both sides would welcome the fact the responsibility for the tax levied would be distinctly established and those responsible for that levy have to answer. It works that way to a degree but it gets beclouded.

THE COMMISSIONER: There still would have to be some type of coordination. The Municipal Council could not fix a mill rate without regard to what the school rate would be; could it?

MR. PARKER: I feel that the Municipal Council's tax rate should be established upon the need that that Council sees.

THE COMMISSIONER: You must also have an eye to the resources.

MR. PARKER: This is correct and it is the resources that ought to have an eye to the taxes levied by the different people. I don't see why, although there is always a possibility, that this need to affect either side's taxes if they proceed

to exercise the same careful economic control of their actions that they now do. I don't see why, for instance, taking the year 1964 that any greater amount of taxes should have been asked for either side than is now asked jointly.

THE COMMISSIONER: I must say that I see merit in your proposal and I was just wondering what the difficulties might be.

MR. PARKER: To me they would be mechanical. I concur in what has happened at the Mayors' and Reeves' meetings. Either they should have more power -- and this is what they ask for -- but I happen to be going down the other road. I can see their viewpoint but I say instead of giving you the power relieve you of the chore.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much, Mr. Parker. May I have a copy of your statement?

MR. PARKER: The additional comment?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

MR. PARKER: Yes. I will give it to the Secretary.

SUBMISSION OF COUNCILLOR N. MAUGHAN, EAST YORK

MR. MAUGHAN: Mr. Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen. With your permission, sir, I would like to just first of all dwell on the points I have here, the suggestions to improve the present Metro government. Of course in my brief I think you will see that I state that I thought that the present Metropolitan government as now constituted should remain and in order to strengthen that government I stated that each municipality should elect from its Council a representative to the Metro Council on a yearly basis.

Now I do not agree that in every case the Chairman of the Council should be the representative on the Metro Council. I feel that sometimes you may have a member of Council who would be a better person to be on Metro than the Reeve. You might have a case where the Reeve would be a good person to administer locally but not necessarily a good person to represent the community on Metro. Also this person, other than the Reeve or the head of the Council, would have more time to do this and also it would be on a yearly basis and he would be closer to the Council.

It appears to me this is what happens in many cases and it has happened actually in our own Council where the head of the Council has indicated their thoughts or desires on Metro and it is absolutely contrary to all members of Council. It seems to me that is not a good thing. I also feel that when the

Reeve is elected as an individual person, he or she has no responsibility to the Council and it would seem to me that this would be a better idea if one member from Council, who would have more time and also be more directly connected with the Council, would be appointed.

This also would, I believe, at election time create more interest. Each member of Council would have a chance of being a representative on Metro.

Now my second point is that as far as representation by population is concerned I think that with the exception of the City of Toronto I would suggest that it is my belief that each area municipality should remain and have one representative and that for each additional 100,000 people they have a second representative, not voting but a second representative. I don't feel this would upset Metro. I feel it is not necessary to have a base between area municipalities and city. I think that is a bad thing. If one or the other had more it would lend itself to doing away with the bickering and there would be more cooperation among the group that is there.

The third point, sir, is that I think that all Metropolitan roads which are in a municipality should be the responsibility, as far as maintenance is concerned, of the municipality concerned. Any municipality can buy equipment as cheap as anybody else; the manpower is the same and they are on the job;

they are close at hand and there is more economy. There is another thing that does happen now in a municipality where they have a Metropolitan road going through the municipality. It might be that the Metropolitan government has time or does immediately snow plow a road through the centre of the township and in the meantime the municipality concerned starts trying to do the collector roads and the ratepayers in that municipality say: "Here is Metro and they are cleaning the road quickly. Why can't you do the same with the collector roads?" It causes a lot of complaints. I believe it would be better if the maintenance of Metro roads, with the exception of Expressways, would be the responsibility of the area municipality concerned.

Now with your permission I would like to emphasize particularly the Fire Department and also our Recreation Department. In our Fire Department at the moment we have 79 people of all ranks. We go 42 hours a week, the same as Toronto. I believe Forest Hill has 48 hours per week and other municipalities with some volunteers. I am speaking of East York because I think it is a very compact Fire Department. They are area-wise and they know when a fire breaks out where it is. They do not have to fumble about. They are familiar with all the buildings and so familiar that they know the personnel. I think that is a very important thing in fire fighting in any municipality.

As far as the per capita cost is concerned at the moment Swansea has got a per capita

cost of 90¢ per capita; in East York it is $1.24; Toronto is $10.00, I think. Now naturally that is only for the year 1963. It is $10.99 to be exact in Toronto. That could change, of course, over a five year period. It shows that the larger the population it appearsto be the higher the cost per capita for keeping the Fire Department in operation.

That is fire loss per capita that I was referring to. It is 97¢ for Swansea; $1.24 for East York; and $10.99 for Toronto.

Now as far as the cost per capita is concerned, as far as I can estimate with 79 all ranks in Toronto and a population of 72,000 and 1,232 all ranks and a population of 700,000 it runs $7.00 in East York per capita and in Toronto about $10.00.

Now I would like to mention one other point about the Recreation Department. If we were changed or absorbed it seems to me we would lose an important thing and that is our volunteers. We have approximately 15 people as a professional staff but we have 650 people as volunteers and they put in, as far as we can estimate, it is very difficult to estimate, and this is probably an educated guess, they put in 23,000 hours. If we figure that at $1.50 per hour, the Township gets $34,500.00. Those are volunteers and we don't want to lose them. We feel if amalgamation took place or we were absorbed we would lose them.

THE COMMISSIONER: Why?

MR. MAUGHAN: Because, sir, we feel that

the contact or the people who are responsible for getting this volunteer group would probably disappear.

THE COMMISSIONER: Are you trying to tell me if the system were changed these volunteers would lose interest in their locality?

MR. MAUGHAN: They would not lose interest in their locality but after all the people who get the volunteers to come are a certain group and this group of people here might be dissolved if we are amalgamated. I imagine that our Recreation Department as we know it now would disappear and something else would take its place. The incentive would be gone and these people would disappear like dirt thrown into a river. It would go eventually.

THE COMMISSIONER: I don't know what would happen under amalgamation but I would assume under an amalgamated system there would have to be some decentralization and if volunteers are really interested in their community or neighbourhood they would retain that interest.

MR. MAUGHAN: I think that may be all right in theory but I don't think it would work in practice. I have been one of the volunteers. I was a volunteer on the hockey association for five years and how did I get that job? I was contacted by the Recreation Director, who has a direct contact with our Council. Now if that came down through three or four levels of supervision I am sure it would not have happened, I will put it that way. I think you would lose the majority of the people.

THE COMMISSIONER: You mean you would be prepared to volunteer as long as you could deal with a director but you would not volunteer if you got instructions from an assistant director?

MR. MAUGHAN: Not necessarily, I think I would be. In a big field you cannot get to the centre; you would not find what is going on. The lines of supervision would be so low that it is like a big firm and when you try and get something done with all the levels of supervision, the man in the middle doesn't want the big boss to know what is going on. I would not like that sort of thing. I am sure you would lose a lot of the volunteers.

Now there is one other point that I would like to express, if I may. I don't want to take up too much of your time. I am sure you have heard most of the arguments and the only reason I came was I felt you should hear personally a lone Councillor's views at the grass roots. If you want to find out something you have to go to the fellow affected. I never served on the Metro Council, although I have studied it. For that reason I feel I have a particular part here in this Commission and investigation.

Now, one of the things that is bad in our Municipality, of course, is our assessment of industrial to residential. We have 22% industrial and 78% residential.

THE COMMISSIONER: You are the first spokesman for East York who has admitted that there is anything bad about East York.

MR. MAUGHAN: That part is a bad point. I am going to leave that, sir. In spite of that our people are not complaining. They feel they are community-minded and they will accept these things. We cannot do anything about it. They would prefer it that way than to be gobbled up by somebody else, in spite of the fact of the possibility that might change and taxes would level off somewhat.

THE COMMISSIONER: You would not mind gobbling up Leaside?

MR. MAUGHAN: Well,sir, I didn't mention that, you did.

THE COMMISSIONER: I asked you a question.

MR. MAUGHAN: I will put it this way: As you are aware Leaside is 50% -- 50% approximately. I don't think the people in Leaside would probably want it.

Now, I have one other point with regards to parks. I think it has been said in the newspapers that Toronto has given the people so much to the Metropolitan government. In East York we gave roughly over 200 acres of valley land which was not developed for $1.00 to the Conservation Authority. Those valley lands most likely will be used by everybody concerned, the people in Toronto and North York and all over the place whenever they get developed. I think that is a good contribution as far as we are concerned.

Now I just want to say one more thing before I quit and that is bigness. Everybody seems to

think that bigness is the ultimate. They think that bigness, if you have bigness you have everything. If that was the case I think instead of one man on this Royal Commission there would be eight or ten. Bigness I don't think is best.

There is one other point I might make. If you have bigness and make one mistake it is often vital. If you have a number of small communities and one of them makes a mistake the others don't follow suit. That does happen, for instance, in Unions. They don't all follow the same thing. If one mistake is made by a big corporation it is often difficult to change.

Now I think that is all I have. Thank you very much for listening.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. Maughan. In case some of the newspaper men are not here at the conclusion of this morning's hearing while I think of it I should tell you that the hearing tomorrow will commence at 9:30. I am sorry to get you out of bed so early.

SUBMISSION OF COUNCILLOR L. H. SAUNDERS

MR. SAUNDERS: Thank you. Doctor. I didn't know that I was going to follow Mr. Maughan and I think some of these presentations might seem to you almost anti-climactic since you have been listening so long and these are individual presentations which must seem in a good many respects rather repetitious.

I note that Mr. Allen in his brief, and also Etobicoke, North York, Scarborough, and York presented some suggestions for a borough system of either five or six units and it is somewhat similar to one of the ideas I am presenting in my own brief. Rather than read mine I thought I would talk, perhaps ad lib on what is in there.

THE COMMISSIONER: I have read your brief and I would be interested if you would develop it.

MR. SAUNDERS: There are one or two points on the last page, sir.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. I didn't know whether you are suggesting them as alternatives.

MR. SAUNDERS: They are.

THE COMMISSIONER: Would you develop that?

MR. SAUNDERS: I have tried to be realistic. I am basing my judgments on some years of experience. I am completing my 25th year in public life and that includes every type of office that a person may be elected to in a municipality. It is not a record in Canada but I am serving on my 4th municipal government, and that itself might be.

While we haven't all the answers I think perhaps looking back over the years we are able to have a certain attitude to some of these problems. I was a member of the first Metro government and I opposed the introduction of Metro, incidentally, in the City Council in 1953 and I led the fight against it and was successful in defeating it as far as Toronto was concerned. The vote was 19-1. It came into operation and as a loyal citizen I found myself not only on Metro but also on the Executive of Metro and I endeavoured hard to make it work. I think Mr. Gardiner can support the fact that we did the very best to make Metro operate on the concept of that time.

My presentation now for the integration of the entire area, differentiating between the idea of annexation or doubling up by one big City, is supported by experience. In two elections in East York I put out literature which went to all the homes in East York and I have headed the poll in two elections we had. It could be argued it was not a factor, it was not an issue. That may be so but I could argue conversely. It at least did not do me any harm in the election campaign.

I agree that some form of Metro was necessary in 1953 or earlier because there was conflict with respect to water. What brought on the Metro urge for some unification was on the question of water more than any other thing. I can remember as a Comptroller in the City of Toronto, North York continually coming to the City and asking for particular services to be

extended into the area. It was like a man saying: "I want to borrow your automobile. I will put the gas in but you pay for the investment of the car." This also applied to sewage on the north end of the City. The people on the south end were complaining about it, not unnaturally. We said: "The mains are not large enough. We cannot give you more water without spending hundreds of thousands on extending the main. We will have to build mains from the Lake. We would like you to commit the Township to paying a portion of the extra main." It could be said by the government or the Municipal Board that they were not interested; that they wanted to take a few millions of gallons and cut it off the next week. It was impossible. That thing had to come to a head.

That was one of the main factors, I think, in the setting up of the Commission to bring in the report which Mr. Cumming did. That Bill 80 was supposed to be a remedy for that.

I think that Metro establishing a second or additional level of government, an extra Council with extra officials, was a duplication. And sometimes there was conflict of interest and confliction of duties and responsibilities. It was so in traffic, welfare, housing, parks, engineering, and sewers. In the ten years since then there have been many other services, such as parks, and they have taken over a green belt. The parks were not in Bill 80 but now they have: Toronto Island, Conservation, Air Pollution Control, Civil Defence, Licensing, Police,

Traffic Regulation, Pensions, and part of Health and Welfare.

Now it has been suggested, and we hear it so frequently in Metro, we will take over the balance of Health. We have four stages here handling Health and Welfare. In Britain Health and Welfare comes under the National Government. Here we have three levels of Health and Welfare. Now, education has been suggested and fire, garbage, all traffic departments, ambulance service, recreation, libraries. These things have been discussed at some stage in the last few years. That would leave little or nothing for local government and one of the strange things is that some of those people who oppose amalgamation or creeping amalgamation, support these things in Metro. I argue with some people in the Township and ask them: "Did you support this thing in Metro?" They said: "Yes". I said: "You are opposed to amalgamation. You can't have it both ways." Whether that is a good thing or not I couldn't say.

If they are going to take things over it will leave nothing for the local municipality except the collection of taxes and snow cleaning. They would not even have garbage, except for the picking up of garbage.

There could be a good case for the revision of the local government with some reference to the type of government that they have in the London County Council. One time I was in England and studied this. I can't say I studied it. It is like a person who

goes to a country for two or three days and then comes back and gives a lecture on the country. I got information when I was there and I got a book about it and I think ours more closely represents the London County Council except on the basis of representation.

As you are aware, they elect a separate Council entirely. Mr. Maughan made some reference to that.

I appeared before the Cummings Commission in 1957 with some similar observations and then I appeared before Mr. Beckett's Committee in 1962. I have endeavoured to keep these views before the responsible bodies in all the years that have intervened. I have not pursued the idea in a manner that would make it a continual agitation. I think I can say that here is a point where some people have made a mistake. Some members of Toronto are continually pursuing the matter so that there arose a reaction from other people and they thought that Toronto was trying to gobble them up. It is the attitude by some spokesmen of Toronto that they want to make all the rest into one big City of Toronto. It meant annexation and I think it irritated a lot of folks.

I think I can say Metro is working well but I think it could work better. I don't think Metro should be disturbed unless it can be seen that a much better type of government can operate. Rather than creating a lot of bad feeling I would far sooner see it operate the way it is. I was on it for a year and nine months, the balance of 1953 and all of 1954.

It was not the ideal in my mind but perhaps we cannot get the ideal and since it did serve some purpose I have not agitated that it should be disturbed, if it meant we were going to have two distinct groups of people in all the area municipalities arguing whether it was good or bad. The one big city is a million and three-quarters people. It is sometimes argued that is too large. I think that is a matter of opinion. I don't know how high is up or how large is too large.

I have a report by a man named Hall who writes about "London in the year 2,000". He says that London may have another 4,000,000 people by the year 2,000 and perhaps it will not be a bad thing.

The Honourable Herbert Morrison in his book "How London Is Governed" said, among other things, the ideal would have been one city. He calls it the "City That Might Have Been". Instead of having one large city long years ago all these municipalities sprang up in the dormitories and today they haven't one city.

If I were asked the right size for a city I would say 200,000. If you start from scratch I don't see how anybody could say how large a city would be before it could not operate efficiently and properly. I think it is a matter of opinion.

The size of Council has been argued. It has been argued that the Council would be too large and it has been suggested one overall city split up into twelve section. I remember Montreal had 99. You will know whether it is still 99. It was three sections of 33

and I think there was some change.

THE COMMISSIONER: It is 46 now.

MR. SAUNDERS: I suppose somebody could argue 46 is better than 99. I know the basis on which the three sections of 33 were elected is entirely different to our basis here. I think there is merit in having more equitable representation.

Now I have three suggestions here and one is to leave it as is. I have not gone into the value of this. When I appeared before the Cumming Commission in 1957 I was asked what might be saved or what the costs were. I did not have the answer. You would have to have a chartered accountant go into these things and figure it out. I can say that setting up another level of officials certainly costs more than not having another level of officials. You would have to see what the compensating values were, relating dollars to the efficiency or services rendered. I haven't the answer for that but I suggest that we leave it as it is with a separate Council.

It has been suggested that, for instance, the East York Council instead of having the Reeve automatically it might choose Mr. Maughan or somebody else to sit on the Council. That is not my view. The London type of Council is that East York or an area would elect one or two persons to the Metro Council. I have that in mind because I question how those who are elected, especially in the City of Toronto, can give their time to all the jobs there are to do. I speak with some authority on this matter. I was a Comptroller

for five years in Toronto before Metro came into existence and those who know how we operate know it is a full-time job. We were there all the time and the only respite I got was perhaps on a Friday afternoon I would go back to my business and issue the paycheques. Then Metro came on and we tried to be as assiduous in our work there. It was a terrible burden and it is a marvel how these people can do that job, which is a full-time job, and take on other responsibilities which are almost another full-time job. There are not enough hours in the day. There is not enough brain power to absorb all the material that has to be absorbed and I think sometimes they don't absorb it. When I went home I would have my reports by the radio and after my wife went to bed I would listen to the news and then go through the night reading these things. Then you have to re-read them to study them.

I think that is a very strong point and I question that they are able to take care of all the duties that are evolving upon them.

THE COMMISSIONER: Excuse me. You say you would have a Metropolitan Council elected in the local municipality at the same time?

MR. SAUNDERS: At the same time.

THE COMMISSIONER: Would you have him sit on the local Council too?

MR. SAUNDERS: No.

THE COMMISSIONER: Don't you think there is some benefit in having a man who is on the local Council also on the Metropolitan Council?

MR. SAUNDERS: Yes, undoubtedly. I am thinking of the London County system. They don't sit together. It could be because of the old set-up still operates in Counties. The Deputy Reeve or the Reeve sits on but the Mayor doesn't. The duties in the County Council I don't think can be compared. The Metro Council is a master city government.

I think perhaps what you say has merit. It could be that this person could sit on both, but if he sat on both and sat in Toronto he could not be a Comptroller and give the time. It might be a sort of second alderman or something like that. They are arguing now that the aldermanic job is a full-time one. If that is so the Comptroller must be more so.

THE COMMISSIONER: In Winnipeg they have the other system.

MR. SAUNDERS: I am not aware how it is working except from talking to some friends and I don't know that they are aware.

THE COMMISSIONER: It has been criticized from the beginning. It has been criticized very severely, their reasoning being if a man is elected solely to Metro the local municipality has no particular interest in Metro and there is much more squabbling.

MR. SAUNDERS: That could be so. Mr. Maughan had a point when he preceded me with respect to East York. I have argued that we have no right to tie the Reeve, although I disagree with her. It has happened on two or three occasions that the Reeve's vote in Metro does not reflect our opinion. My argument is

she represents East York and not our Council. The people knew when they elected her she would sit on Metro and she does not have to be guided by what we say. It has happened two or three times that Council has had an entirely opposite view to what she has presented on the Metro Council.

Then I suggest six boroughs ...

THE COMMISSIONER: As an alternative?

MR. SAUNDERS: As an alternative. I make the alternative because it could be that by suggesting one Council for all Metro we would disturb the amity of the people. I am not anxious to do that. I think the views on Metro are perhaps as divided as the views on a new flag, sir. I don't think anything would be as divisive in this country as a new flag issue coming up now. I have a very strong view on that. It is one of these things that goes down the middle. There couldn't be any 50-50, yes or no.

I did make a suggestion to Leslie Frost. Our names were the same and we became good friends. This was an off-the-cuff discussion. I suggested that perhaps we could have a vote taken and if the minorities were large that we would not make any change but it would have to be a very strong majority in favour of the change. I can remember the liquor vote in 1926 and the country went dry by 52 votes. The Premier of the day, George Howard Ferguson, said: "That is a very strong authority." We had the Liquor Control Board Act that came in right away.

I would think rather than have two

distinct different views of opinion that it would be far better to leave it the way it is.

One brief has suggested a uniform base educational rate. I haven't studied that but I think there could be merit in that for the municipalities that have very low industrial taxable property. In East York we have a very low rate and it makes the educational rate higher. I see where Scarborough is similarly affected. It may be the commercial-industrial rate could affect the educational rate basically and it could be levelled out in the same way that Metro has levelled out welfare rates.

My third suggestion is one new city. I call it "integration" as against annexation or amalgamation. I remember the former Mayor of the City who talked about being the Mayor of all the people. Fred Gardiner used to kid him and say he was Mayor of none of the people. I think Nate had the idea he would like to have been Mayor of the Greater City. Their idea was Toronto would take them all in at one time or altogether and there would be a Toronto Council. My idea has always been different from that. I would say that the government should bring in another Bill 80 dissolving them all on "X" date and set a pattern for the entire area and then the Reeve of Scarborough could, for instance, move up to be the Mayor, or something of that nature. It would not mean Toronto gobbling them up. They would all be dissolved.

I put that forth in my brief to the Cumming's Commission and the Beckett Commission. I

suggested that if there were any question in the minds of those who have to make the decision, that is the legislature, that eventually it could be a plebiscite. That would safeguard the interests of all the people in the area.

Then I finally say you might not get the ideal anyway. We are not starting from scratch and it is better to leave well enough alone with some revision of the boundaries. I think there could be some revision of the boundaries and it is better to do that than upset the whole area. I think Metro is doing quite nicely because I don't think any type of government is perfect. We will not get it outside of Heaven anyway.

The one real complaint is representation when it is all boiled down. Some people object to a big municipality of 250,000 people only having one representative and another municipality with 14,000 people has one representative. There may be some way of ironing that out.

THE COMMISSIONER: I have one point, Mr. Saunders. You started out by talking about duplication. I assume you were talking of duplication as between Metro and the area municipalities?

MR. SAUNDERS: That is right.

THE COMMISSIONER: Is there really duplication? Let me give you a few instances. In assessment there is no duplication?

MR. SAUNDERS: That is one in which it is not.

THE COMMISSIONER: Police, licensing --

MR. SAUNDERS: We do some licensing.

THE COMMISSIONER: You still do some licensing?

MR. SAUNDERS: I think we do.

THE COMMISSIONER: But it is not major?

MR. SAUNDERS: No.

THE COMMISSIONER: Do you consider there is duplication in water and sewage, for example, because Metro has the exclusive jurisdiction in the matter of trunk lines and wholesaling water? The local municipality is merely in charge of distribution. Is that not right?

MR. SAUNDERS: Where I used the term "duplication" it is with regard to officials. It is where we set up another Department of Works with a highly paid official at the top and a lot of other officials. Another municipality has a Department of Works. They all have Finance Commissioners. If you had the one Finance Commissioner you would have a staff but they would not be escalated to a $20,000 a year job. You have 13 officials doing the same job of work that the same officials do in Metro. I am not suggesting that there would be a saving of all the staff but you would not have the duplication of auditors, Finance Commissioners, Commissioners of Works, Commissioners of Parks and Commissioners of Welfare -- all the top brass people. I am not saying it unkindly but you would not have all the top echelon of salaries that we have to have. There would be some areas set up but they

would be lower paid officials. I certainly would not want to press the point. It may be argued that we get service for the dollars spent and it could be so.

Thank you, Doctor.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. Saunders.

SUBMISSION OF MR. J. C. VAN ESTERIK

MR. VAN ESTERIK: Your Honour, I will not digress into my so-called qualifications. I have spent a number of years on the Metropolitan School Board and the Lakeshore Board of Education and I have been with other educational organizations throughout Ontario. I feel I should take this opportunity to thank you for allowing me to present my views. My personal opinions are those of myself alone. They are not guided. Maybe I have a different philosophy but I believe my responsibility is to every child in the Metropolitan area and in Canada. Therefore, when I decree that I would fight towards an educational system I am working for every child who I think is an asset to our country and undoubtedly is our most treasured possession.

As my brief has tried to point out, equal educational opportunity for all does not exist in Metropolitan Toronto, irrespective of what any other individual has said up to this point. I believe that educational opportunity is not only desirable but necessary and it is a right inherited by any child born in the Metropolitan area or who comes to reside in the Metropolitan area.

Under the present Metropolitan School Board great gains were made by Local Area Boards. One was the site acquisition plan financed by Metro.

I don't want to digress into the frailities of the systems prior to Metro. I think you have been armed by a number of statistics but it was not

unknown that some members within Metro would have failed to meet their obligations educationally had not the Metropolitan School Board been formed.

In relation to school buildings in the whole of Metro we have now what is known as the metropolitan formula. It is a standard dollar value for the design of a school and thereby all the children are getting equality of school facilities and if some area wishes to make a better building available they may do so at added cost to their own municipality.

This was followed by the Metropolitan School Board assuming opportunity classes, auxiliary vocational classes, a school for the handicapped, a day school for the deaf. All these things were paid for by the general taxpayer of Metropolitan Toronto at large for these people. You have equality to those who are handicapped but to those who are accelerated or in the normal rank, who form the nucleus of our new citizens, we do not have equalization of opportunity nor do we have equalization of tax. Why must we permit the denial of this equal opportunity to the children of Metro?

The true analysis of education is that it is most essential to the future of Toronto to educate every child and every adult so that they will be both desirous and capable of contributing to the growth of Toronto, Ontario, and Canada in general. The leadership that a great centre such as Toronto can give education is a responsibility that it owes as being an integral part of Canada.

Education is now floating in a sea of disunity of educational philosophy. In research alone waste of resources is pitiful. Every Board in Metro area is researching to some degree and in some cases it is called experimenting. It is my contention that research and experimenting done by one central body has a great advantage. A pilot programme could be effectively enlarged if found to be a positive programme throughout the system with effective cooperation and control.

In the study of educational TV much time and effort has been spent but because of no central authority and long-range study the results have been inconclusive. Various joint educational groups have tried to stimulate this. Even one has reserved a TV channel for future use. I feel that a centralized school authority in Toronto could carry on a positive TV study and a pilot operation such that a smaller municipality would be unable to do.

I believe that the present Board is too small to support and educational research programme to serve the area but if Metro was all one educational Board the study of projects would be a small part of the total educational cost.

My opinion is that new educational programmes are not accepted on the knowledge that it is not positive but rather on the decision not to proceed on a programme is based on the ignorance of whether it can serve a purpose or not. I submit we have no right to permit ignorance to be our guide.

I would like to now point out the reasoning behind my submission of ten areas, 50 trustees, and trustee pay. My submission is based on the public school panel only as the Metropolitan Separate School Board now administer to most of the Separate Schools that exist in Metropolitan Toronto. My recommendations are only relative to the public school system.

I feel that 50 trustees are sufficient although at the present time there is over 100. Numbers on Boards have some value. I have found that members and trustees on the Board of Education are a dedicated group of citizens and therefore I feel that ten administrative Districts with five trustees each could ably serve the community.

THE COMMISSIONER: What would be the functions of the administrative Districts? Would you give complete control over education to the central Board?

MR. VAN ESTERIK: Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: What would the Districts do? What jurisdiction and discretion would they have?

MR. VAN ESTERIK: I actually have it in there, if I might continue ...

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I am sorry.

MR. VAN ESTERIK: That is all right. The five trustees would be as heretofore the representative of the community, responsible and entrusted with providing and expanding of educational philosophy in that area. The administrative District

would have a Chairman and four trustees. The administration staff would have a Board Secretary and Director of Education, who could be followed by the Superintendents of secondary, elementary and Special Coordinated Studies.

Two trustees from this Administration District, along with two from the other nine Districts, plus two from the Separate School Board would constitute the Metropolitan Toronto School Board whose function would be to provide and control finance, policy, research, special education, adult education, buildings, professional developements, recruitment, salary of professional employees.

I would love the opportunity to expand on these but I don't think it is fair to do this to you, sir. You have a responsibility to the whole Metro area and I am talking about one small cleavage which to me is the important portion. The complete area is blocked off and I have heard of other submissions. They talk about professional development; they talk about professional teachers' salaries and various things. I know you are aware of the conditions, of the discontent and the distrust over salaries. This breaks down to one thing only. There has been no planning here for the needs of the teachers of the future.

We are buying what is on the market today. I believe Metro as a large body could do a great job in professional development; it could do a great job in recruitment and thereby at the same time naturally having full control over the salary of the

ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.
TORONTO, ONTARIO

professional employee and it could work itself into an organization to provide teachers for the City rather than have the upset where they are making teachers out of people who are not in the prime of life and didn't accept teaching as a profession. These are people who have digressed from institutional work because they think there is an opportunity in teaching. Nobody yet, as far as I am concerned, has proven to me the real success of taking on these people who have spent ten or fifteen years in institutional work. I have heard of individual cases that have not been successful.

The need is here to have a group who is responsible for this on Metro and who will assume this responsibility.

The payment of a remuneration to a trustee is long overdue but it must be prescribed and not permissive. Trustees are a very generous group of people and even myself when I was a member of the group did not feel I should be remunerated on any basis. I loved the work and wanted to do it. I realize this is not right. The position of a trustee does have disadvantages. The responsibility of a trustee is such that it is necessary to have invasion of his normal daily occupation by meetings and special events, visits and deputations. Trustees should be reimbursed for the loss of productivity on the daily work day.

This would permit and provide for the recruitment of trustees of a cross-section of a community and not be restricted to pensioners, self-

employed businessmen or professionals, or community-minded ladies. This would, I believe, encourage into educational trusteeship a better cross-section of the community as a stipend would be a reimbursement to augment the loss of income from their daily occupations. A Metropolitan Chairman of some years ago quoted a loss in his income of something like $3,500.00 a year. He felt it was his duty as he had been made Chairman of Metropolitan Toronto and he would have to do the job. He did an admirable job but nevertheless lost his daily income. I don't say it should be reimbursement in kind but nevertheless some value should be put towards it.

Many well meaning people like to live in the past. They respect tradition and in their desire to contain the past they build walls around themselves and they block out a brighter, vigorous, exciting future. Toronto cannot afford to be satisfied with an educational system of the past, based on cultural cells or communities within municipalities. Toronto has a responsibility to its children, not only to supply subways and expressways and other magnificent monuments to man, but Toronto has to give leadership in education and thereby it must be so constituted and organized that the whole of Metropolitan Toronto will jointly and collectively glean from our young people all the talent and skills hidden within them. That small investment in our young people will multiply the benefits to the Metro area many times in all phases of the community.

Your Honour, you have been given a tremendous task in regard to this Commission, which embraces all forms of municipal government in relation to Metropolitan Toronto area. I feel you can contribute more to the future growth and prosperity of Toronto and Canada by your recommendation for the change as to the educational organization here than in any other Department of the Municipal Government.

In our educational system we have the only real tangible investment of the future and by providing an organization that can progress with and prepare ahead of the times the return will be immeasurably greater to the community of Toronto in particular and to Canada as a whole.

SUBMISSION OF MRS. MARY L. AXELSON

MRS. AXELSON: Mr. Commissioner, Mrs. Janes and I said that we were making our submissions as individuals and did not represent any group. That was quite true at the time in January. However, the situation has changed somewhat since then.

THE COMMISSIONER: For the better?

MRS. ACELSON: We hopefully believe so, sir.

After the deadline for briefs, we thought it only fair to acquaint our neighbors with what had been done, if only to confirm our own feelings that others thought as we did. The result was so gratifying - with the limited time at our disposal - that a petition was born; we are now speaking for no less than 325 property owners in a representative cross-section of that area with which we are concerned. It is indicative of the general dissatisfaction that whole blocks have signed. There is a general feeling that if we are not annexed as a result of the recommendations of this Commission, that the petition should be further extended to enable us to apply for annexation under the Municipal Act. We feel that we are speaking today with more honest authority for a greater number of people, than the professional planners and lawyers who have presented the views of Council - views on which the individual taxpayer had no opportunity to express an opinion - although he still has to pay for them. I have the petition to offer in evidence and will at this time read only the preamble to show that these people

knew what they were signing.

We have employed no professional help in our research, preparation of the brief nor in the presentation.

We realize that our brief may seem to constitute an indictment of our local municipal administration (we realize that is not what you are dealing with) - and to some extent that is true. However, it couldn't be avoided if the facts supporting our main contention also lead to the conclusion that the quality of the present administration leaves much to be desired.

That contention, and the basic problem in our fringe area, is that there is complete incompatability between the rural and urban sections.

We have, of course, the highest regard for farmers as a most important factor in the national and local economy. But the differences between what is commonly referred to as "the back" and "the front" when it comes to municipal administration are so great that the best interests of both cannot possibly be achieved in the present set-up. As far as we are concerned, the only possible solution is the early inclusion, by annexation, of the urbanized areas into the Metro concept.

Several other solutions have been mentioned and I should like to deal briefly with them.

There is first, the suggestion in York County's brief as submitted by Mr. Murray Jones, that the fringe areas should not be annexed for some 20-30

years. As recently as January 24, 1964, York County Council was advised by the same Mr. Jones, (as quoted in the Globe and Mail), that "any move to take the County's six southern municipalities out of the Metro planning area would be unwise and would probably be rejected by the province". Yet in the brief a month ago, there was the suggestion that a County planning area should be formed.

At the time when the CNR bypass location was made known, the late Mr. Kyle, vice-president in charge of planning and development, made a statement to offset opposition to the railroad. He said that the present location was chosen after two years of exhaustive study and consultations with such corporate bodies and authorities as the Toronto Harbor Commission, Toronto Transit Commission, Toronto Board of Trade, the Department of Highways and Metro Planning Board among others. After saying that the Metro Planning Board was instituted to "avoid the chaos of piece-meal planning", he went on to say that the location had been chosen because, "a basic consideration in our long-range thinking is the expectation that this project will be engulfed, - and the sooner the better - by a fast growing metropolis".

We do not believe that Mr. Kyle had Richmond Hill in mind at the time - and would not have it now, in view of the town's, by its own admission, rather precarious financial position. We have already been subjected to chaotic planning and after playing the role of guinea pig for many years, we now feel entitled

to orderly, intelligent planning from a proven successful Township, that of North York, in conjunction with an enlarged Metro.

Then there is so-called regional development. If our County were to be a substantial part of regional planning, we the urban part would still be in much the same situation. With the addition of Halton (except Burlington), Peel and Ontario Counties, our problem would be three times greater.

Four or five years ago York County Council met with these same Counties to discuss this subject. Agreement between the Counties could not be reached - and the study was abandoned.

The only kind of regional planning we are interested in, is the one which will include us in the Metro region.

In the brief we are concerned with many things. On some of them I will mention briefly some additional reasons for that concern, and I am prepared to deal further with any questions you may have.

With regard to Health, we gave some examples in the brief. Since then we have had the annual report from the MOH of York County. In this report it is stated that the number of food poisoning cases in York County was disturbing and that some day this situation is going to "explode in our faces";due to lack of authority the public health unit cannot enforce reasonable standards for the protection of swimmers' health and safety; irresponsibility was allowed to prevail at pools; venereal disease is increasing in York County;

typhoid fever and diptheria are still present and dangerous; and none of the 21 municipal water systems in the County are fluoridated.

Since that report, 17 of 19 nurses resigned but were subsequently rehired; however, not only the MOH himself, but his two assistants as well as the doctor in charge of the mental health clinic have resigned. Apparently no applications for these positions on a permanent basis have been received - despite much advertising about the "challenging" position. Once again we have been forced to rely on our friendly neighbor to the south for help in an emergency; our present temporary MOH is a North York import.

The failure of the Health Unit illustrates clearly once again our basic and overriding problem: rural versus urban thinking. A member of County Council recently stated, "We've done without a health unit before, and can again". You will no doubt agree that such a situation and such an outlook in a built-up area are not acceptable.

We mention Hydro. I have here schedules showing that a householder using 1217 kilowatt hours would pay a net of $20 in Markham - $17.17 in Richmond Hill - and only $15.27 in North York. It does not matter that in our particular district we are as entitled to the urban rates as any part of North York.

Our water rates are more than double those of North York. In addition we pay 50% of our water will as a sewage meter charge to Metro. This fee for processing sewage is not based on consumption in the

case of less than 7500 gallons being used but on net, which would necessarily be cheaper for small families and widows. It has been stated that "emergency water service is available from North York". Despite a new water tower and standpipe, Markham is still unable to supply our urban section with adequate all-year service. From June 6th '63 to June 5th '64, Markham quietly purchased 7,464,600 gallons of water. I would like to point out that much the same situation existed in North York before the formation of Metro. It was proven then, as it is now, that wells are not the answer to urban water needs.

A letter from the Canadian Underwriters Association tells us that our fire insurance rates are much higher than in North York because, and I quote, "your area is dependent on protection borrowed from other municipalities".

With regard to education, we refer to both standards and costs. As to standards, we have only our personal opinions - and those of 325 signatories - to offer, based as they are on years of personal experience. However, I believe I can safely refer you for confirmation, to the files of the Department of Education, which are not available to us as individuals.

Once again, however, we run into our now familiar complaint; a totally urbanized section in a rural township. The rural view of Bill 54, (an Act reducing the number of school boards in order to provide equality of education), was recently stated by the chairman of the York County Federation of Agriculture, who

pointed out that under Bill 54, the rural mill rate would rise in some areas from 19.1 mills to 26.9 - while the urban district rate would be reduced from 35 mills. That, he said would be "inequable" since a "centrally located school would be used mainly to educate urban students". No mention was made of the report in March '64 by the MOH, that of 156 school buildings in York County - 85, or more than half, did not score 100% on health inspection. The reasons were lack of provision for sanitary water, including, "no water, not enough water, polluted water requiring boiling or chlorination" - all in rural schools on septic tanks.

After a visit from the Federation of Agriculture to Queen's Park, Bill 54 was amended for its third reading - to the extent that there could now be two school areas in one township. Presently there is a plan in Markham Township municipal offices showing the two sections - the rural section and the urban section - with one significant change. One of the urban schools is shown in the rural portion - since that school has industrial assessment nearby. This instance graphically illustrates the fact that the rural portion rejects everything about the urban section - with the exception of urban money.

Our inevitable conclusion is that rather than the "reorganization of administration" as suggested in a previous presentation, we require a reorganization of rural thinking - and this could take generations.

THE COMMISSIONER: You don't think I can do that with my Commission?

MRS. AXELSON: Oh, I wish you could. I do.

In the case of regional planning, this would obviously still be a major problem in York County.

With regard to planning, there is an apparent weakness in the control over the fringe areas. We speak in the brief of high-handed procedures, with Township Council proceeding with developments not yet in conformity with the official plan. When this was drawn to the attention of the Ontario Municipal Board, the chairman observed that if this is so, "it is regrettable, but not within the jurisdiction of this Board".

I have here certain photographs proving this disregard for proper procedures and in some cases for our bylaws. Those bylaws seem to mean nothing, for in the words of our Reeve on January 30 this year, "Any bylaw can be changed. Some bylaws are not worth the paper they're written on if somebody wants to contest them. We could have a bylaw one week and have it changed the next." The folder of photographs amply illustrates this attitude, which certainly leaves us to wonder what security and protection we have.

In conclusion, then, I say on behalf of myself, Mrs. James and no less than 325 property owners in our district, that after consideration of all alternatives, we find ourselves left with only one hope for a future as "equal class" citizens. That hope is that you will find the evidence in favor of our early incorporation as an integral part of North York and Metropolitan Toronto.

Now I would like to introduce Mrs. James who is handling the presentation on assessment.

SUBMISSION OF MRS. KATHLEEN JAMES

THE COMMISSIONER: What is the population in the Highland Park subdivision?

MRS. JAMES: Around 6,000 in the southwest corner. Approximately 150 homes in the Highland Park subdivision. This includes a district that includes another subdivision, a large portion of it called Grand View Estates, another portion Doncaster. We have signatories from Thornhill Village itself.

We have asked ourselves the question: What are the advantages, or otherwise, assessment and taxwise, of 10 years as a "dormitory" under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Corporation for planning purposes only; and what are the advantages, or otherwise, of being a suburban area on the southern fringe of Markham Township and the County of York, both of which are predominantly rural? Last but not least: What are the future prospects for this fringe area under the present three levels of administration?

We have come to the conclusion that despite the obvious interdependence of all parts of the Township in most important respects, it is nevertheless a fact that the necessary co-operation is almost non-existent.

The argument used against Metro annexation of this fringe area is that the loss of assessment would be a disaster to the County of York and its southern municipalities.

In two years, 1962-63, not a whisper was raised, nor was it considered a disaster to the

urbanized area of Markham, when $137,000 of farm assessment was lost to the Township in January, 1963, by annexation to Stouffville; or when rural assessment decreased by $400,000 in Markham and $250,000 in Vaughan through the application of Sec. 35 in the Assessment Act. Other rural districts in the County also received similar benefits.

The over-all result of this is that the burden of taxes on the urban area has obviously increased proportionately to the decrease of farm assessments and taxes.

We cannot, of course, afford to lose any assessment whatsoever. The truth of this is particularly emphasized in the area of school costs.

In the York Central High School District, comprising 150 square miles of the Townships of Markham and Vaughan, Richmond Hill and Woodbridge, the figures on 'assessment per pupil' clearly show that we are at the very bottom. This assessment per pupil in our area is less than half of that in North York. In 1962, the figure for York Central was $23,164 - in North York it was $52,000 and in Toronto $86,200.

A further comparison shows that our York Central figure has steadily decreased - from $34,031 in 1959 to $21,723 in 1963. Although the total assessment in York Central District has gone up, from 1959 to 1963, from $52.4 million to $71.7 million or about 36 percent, the number of pupils in the same time rose from 1,540 to 3,300 - an increase of more than 100 percent.

The only conclusion we can arrive at is that poor planning has led to assessment poverty and second-rate education.

We look with deep concern on Sec. 37 of the Assessment Act. The Department of Municipal Affairs in its Manual for Assessors points out that if one applies for benefits under either Sec. 35 or Sec. 37, one is NOT entitled to benefits under both - that is, both lower assessments and exemptions. Yet in Markham the rural area certainly enjoys both: 85 percent of the agricultural area is assessed at the lowest figure of $38.50, and under Sec. 37, 90 percent of the land of a farm is exempt from the tax levy for fire and police, whose owner's principle occupation is farming.
Sec. 35 was amended by striking out "principle occupation".

We in the southwest corner, on the other hand, bear ALL the FULL costs of all the services shown on our tax bills as area charges. Some of these services benefit the whole Township through industrial and commercial assessment.

In Vaughan Township, the rural area has an appeal before the court for exemptions from tax levies for police, fire, water and road services. And a brief has been submitted to the Ontario Tax Committee, urging that farm property should be exempted from municipal taxes for the costs of educations, welfare, health, recreation and administration of justice. This brief was presented by Mr. Charles Hoover - a member of the Markham Township Council on behalf of the Scarborough and Associated Farmers Associations (as reported in the Globe

and Mail on February 12, 1964). The brief indicated, that the farmers are more concerned with municipal than with provincial taxation, and that they have no intention of remaining silent while their feathers are plucked.

In the circumstances, we cannot help but wonder who is plucking the most feathers from whom.

Throughout the history of Markham Township, the administration has been dominated by the farm group. Under their guidance we have watched the economy gradually stagnate. If the economy of a Township is based on a healthy balance between residential and industrial and commercial assessment (the recognized ideal being 60-40), our 80-20 ratio certainly leaves a lot to be desired.

The Township's official plan is designed to protect the farms from increasing taxation, as well as to benefit the Metro Corporation by having its food grown near its borders. It also confines residential and industrial development to about 8,000 acres with the other 57,000 acres zoned as farm land.

The southwest corner, with 2,135 acres now having a population of about 6,000, is expected by our planners to grow within the next 10 years to a population of 22,000, mainly through residential developments. It is, I believe, significant that even now our mill rate is 104.7 which compares with North York's 55.64 - all on an approximately equal assessment basis.

The only conclusion we can draw for the future is that it will offer complete financial chaos, with land developers being the only ones benefitting.

Already one such development has been approved, with 1,400 new homes approaching - but with no compensating industry in sight.

What about that future?

The alternatives, apart from annexation by North York or Metro, are rather grim. Richmond Hill would lead us into a new Borough system, which from present appearance would have an even more ruinous ratio in assessments.

York County, on the other hand, would like to keep us for another 20-30 years because we provide 52 percent of its revenues - yet, again, the main interests in its administration are clearly devoted to the agricultural aspects, with the urbanized areas being tolerated only for their financial contribution.

We urge you again, Mr. Commissioner, in the strongest possible terms, to recommend that the particular area for which we are speaking should become part of Metropolitan Toronto - the sooner the better.

THE COMMISSIONER: If it comforts you at all I can tell you that it is not only the farmers of Markham Township who ask for exemption. The same demand was submitted to me on the Commission on Taxation in the Province of Quebec on which I am sitting at the present time. I thought I would mention that to you.

MRS. JAMES: What we are concerned about is: Is this developing into a situation where a handful of us are to carry the 57,000 plus the 2,135 acres, a little corner in the southern portion of Markham.

THE COMMISSIONER: I understand your problem. Thank you very much, Mrs. James.

SUBMISSION OF MR. DALTON J. LITTLE

MR. LITTLE: I do not pretend that my submission does more than outline a few concepts of municipal government and suggest possible approaches to solutions. I have endeavoured to deal objectively with a number of the problems as I see them.

In part because of my experience of some years as a newspaper reporter on daily newspapers and more recently as an editor of a weekly newspaper in Etobicoke --

THE COMMISSIONER: What greater qualifications could you have than as a newspaper man!

MR. LITTLE: Only ordinary intelligence, I hope.

THE COMMISSIONER: You are not distinguishing between the two, are you?

MR. LITTLE: Oh, no.

Partly because I have taken an active interest in local politics and have a continuing interest in government at all levels, I have undertaken to write the Brief we are discussing. I have included consideration of both civic government and education. You will, I expect, have noted that I do not claim to have the only solution on anything other than to refer in some instances to generally recognized principles.

On the subject of municipal government I have developed arguments and offered suggestions in relation to and in support of "The progressive development of local government". We have questioned how far local government may be applied geographically and subjectively.

In other words, how far the localization of municipal government in a given area may be stretched and still remain essentially local in character. You will have noted, Mr. Commissioner, that the references from source material reproduced at the back of the Brief are given or marginally noted following the passages which they are intended to support.

This Brief was written and required copies produced under some pressure because I did not allow sufficient time prior to March 15th last. I regret that in addition to the errors noted by the Errata paragraph we have discovered two more. The third paragraph of page one refers to "The Municipality of Metropolitan Act, 1953..." inadvertently omitting the word "Toronto" after the word "Metropolitan"; also on page seven, paragraph 24, eighth line, "Metropolitan Toronto Act, 1935" which should read "1953".

Now to get back, for a moment, to local government I shall not take time to repeat definitions and explanations as outlined at page 2 of my Brief headed, "Local Government", sub-paragraphs 6 to 9, but I would like to refer to a further discussion under "The Ward System", pages 3 and 4. Concluding sub-paragraph 13 I have said, "A continuing or progressively worsening of public-spirited public service by the politicians, and varying degrees of degeneration at the civic staff level, are too often the collaterals of public apathy". Following this paragraph we ask the reader to "See Ref. No.2".

At sub-paragraph 14, page 4 of my Brief,

I have noted that in a city of a million or more people the citizens of a ward have not self government in the sense that we have been attempting to define it, but rather that they have municipal government in which their local ward councillor has one small voice, or if two aldermen, two small voices. We then go on to say, "The municipal legislative body is often as far removed from close contact with its neighborhoods of homes, schools, churches and community activities generally, as a provincial legislature in a province of comparable population is distant from the people in many of its communities - to wit, the Province of Prince Edward Island."

I recognize that the municipality which has local self government to what we might regard as a satisfactory extent, or truly local self government, is the first stage of local government; that the province under the B.N.A. Act, 1867 is the second level of local government. In relation to the country as a whole the provincial legislature is, in fact, the local government for the territory of Canada in which it has jurisdiction in those matters which were assigned to it by the said Act, - the constitution of this country.

In England it might be argued that because there are no provinces that they only have two levels of government, the municipal and the national. However, for over 60 years the Greater London Area has been under the municipal form of government set up by the London Government Act, 1899 which created the twenty-eight metropolitan boroughs. I note by the recent Royal

ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.
TORONTO, ONTARIO

Commission Report. We might say that the twenty-eight boroughs in the County of London correspond, in a sort of way, to the second level of government in this country, the province. In reference to the Metropolitan Toronto Area, we are, of course, considering two levels of municipal government operating within a large urban area of confederated local municipalities. Such confederation is one entity of municipal government and being the creature of the Provincial Legislature is still the stepping stone, or first level of government, in this country to that of the second level, the Province. So, I submit we continue to have only three levels of government, namely municipal, provincial and federal.

The United Kingdom covers a very small area as compared with Canada or the United States. I believe most Canadians are agreed that because of the different characteristics of the several geographic areas of our land which are the domains of the several provinces that the provincial legislatures are an essential element in the over-all government of Canada.

However, it would appear that the clergy of the Hamilton Conference of the United Church of Canada do not think we need provincial governments. Press reports state that at the 40th annual meeting of that Conference of the United Church, representing 130,000 members of the Church in its area, went on record June 3rd last in favor of the abolition of provincial government in this country.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Little, I am sorry my terms of reference do not cover the abolition or

amalgamation of Provinces. I would like you to come down to Metropolitan Toronto.

MR. LITTLE: The only reason I mention it is I believe if such a situation came about, as I have tried to point out later on, that the citizen at the local level in the community would have to go to Ottawa for everything --

THE COMMISSIONER: I can assure you, coming from Quebec, that there is not a chance in the world that the Provinces will be abolished. They may become States.

MR. LITTLE: I agree with you, sir.

I am sure we have no quarrel with the spiritual leaders of any organized religious group, big or little, taking an active interest in politics, that is in the sense of the term as it relates to public affairs. It is their undoubted right to do so and I think if they want to be good citizens they should make their contribution by taking a positive and active interest in public affairs. Party politics is another matter, - another horse I suppose we might say.

I have referred at page 5 of my Brief under the heading "Civics and Democracy" to dangers inherent in the apathy of the majority of the electorate at election time and have offered suggestions to help overcome this serious situation. In paragraph 18, "Elections of representatives of the people to serve on government at any level, which result from twenty-five to thirty-five percent of the voters exercising the franchise, can spell the doom of democracy. Unless

remedied, such public disinterestedness might, indeed, do so. It may be later than we think!"

We have indicated at pages 11 and 12 of my Brief under the caption "Population Limits" the need to prescribe the area in square miles and boundaries beyond which Metro could not appreciably extend in the foreseeable future.

Some of the "Primary Considerations" in any reorganization of government for the Metropolitan Toronto area are listed under paragraph 39 beginning at page 13. The subjects referred to are listed and outlined briefly in sub-paragraphs (a) to (r). I shall not attempt to review these sections today other than to allude to a few of them in connection with source material that I have had an opportunity to study since preparing the Brief and also in reference to certain submissions that have been made to you, Sir, during the present hearing of your Commission.

I suppose the submission of the City of Toronto, which I have been perusing, is a Brief that those of us who are anxious to see local government preserved and enhanced in the subject area should carefully weigh and consider in so far as that Brief's conclusions and recommendations would, in our opinion, jeopardize local government.

The Toronto City Brief places great emphasis on the disproportionate representation of the area municipalities on Metro Council. This fact is recognized by everybody, figuratively speaking. There are other ways of getting "rep by pop" on the Metro

Council than by permitting the core city, the Metropolis or Mother City to devour her young, or her offspring suburbs.

The City Brief is manifestly a comprehensive compilation of much useful information albeit we cannot agree with certain of its recommendations. More specifically, we take issue with its advocacy of amalgamation, or probably more correctly speaking, of annexations of all the suburbs to the City.

In support of its primary recommendation the said Brief at Chapter VI contends that annexations from 1945 to 1962 in 31 Ontario cities is proof that the practice of annexing urban and semi urban areas to cities is an approved one in the light of favorable decisions on applications to the Ontario Municipal Board. I note, according to the statistics given in the Brief, that none of the 31 cities listed had a population in 1945 of more than 175,039 inhabitants and that by 1963 Ottawa and Hamilton each had reached population totals of only 268,374 and 266,891 respectively. This is a far cry from creating a metropolis, - one chief city, - of over a million and a half people. If we accept the opinion of those who drafted the report of the Royal Commission on Local Government in Greater London, England, local government, in the generally accepted sense, is operative in an urban municipality of 100,000 to 250,000. The Etobicoke Board of Education in its Brief has mentioned 300,000 population as a maximum for an effective school system.

It is evident, therefore, that even

after the annexations to the 31 Ontario centres that the problem of maintaining local government in the enlarged cities had not been, in any instance, necessarily adversely affected by such annexations. Certainly this would appear to be no argument for annexations on a grandiose scale by the City of Toronto.

I notice that the Briefs of a number of the suburban municipalities advocate division of the review area into 4, 5 or other number of boroughs each of which would appoint members of its own local council to the Super Urban Council. or Superban as distinct from Suburban. We would thus perpetuate the indirect representation of the voters of Superbia on the Superban Council, or Metro Council as it is commonly referred to. AT THIS POINT, Mr. Commissioner, I interject to say that in referring to by bible on local government, the 1957-60 Report of the Royal Commission on Local Government in Greater London Chapter 11, page 12 that the second report of the Royal Commission on Municipal Corporations published in 1837 "was devoted entirely to the 'metropolis' as it had come to be called." In referring to the whole 'uninterrupted town' they spoke of the 'metropolitan municipality'. So it is evident that this terminology when referring to a group of adjacent municipalities under an over-all form of government has been in use for well over a hundred years, a much longer time that I had realized when I wrote my Brief, and dealt with the term 'Metropolitan Toronto', sub-paragraphs 22 to 29. The duration of time during which the word 'metropolis' and its adjective form have been used in this sense does

not, of course, affect the root meaning.

I have also pointed out that the indirect representation of voters in the area municipalities on Metro Council would mean a continuation of what we might call "power politics" in the municipal arena of a pseudo confederation of semi-autonomous area municipalities. I have dealt with these two aspects of the subject under "Sectional Interests" page 10 and also under "Primary Considerations" pages 16 to 20, sub-paragraphs (a), (e), (f); and under "The Gathercole Report", page 21, sub-paragraphs 42, 43, 44 and 45. Permit me at this juncture while referring to the Gathercole Report to add four words, by way of elucidation, to sub-paragraph 46, "Representation by population consistent with financial interest". I wish to add to the second to the last sentence of that sub-paragraph the words, "consistent with financial interest". The sentence will then read, "Even a Gathercole economist could not do this consistent with financial interest."

Under Exhibits at the back of my Brief I made reference to the unwillingness of some suburban councillors to agree to direct election to the Metro Council. The first of my series of four articles on local government published in the Eotbicoke Advertiser Guardian, December 6, 1962, page one, I reported having questioned two local municipal candidates at an election campaign meeting and that they both said they opposed such direct representation. I added in my report "This attitude by local councillors is not surprising". I meant by this remark that many area municipality council-

lors, being personally ambitious, look forward to the time when they may possibly become members of the Metro Council, in addition to serving on their own councils.

I advanced reasons for advocating direct representation on the Metro Council under paragraph 39, sub-paragraphs (g) and (i) wherein we pointed out that under such plan the present boundaries of today's area municipalities need not be disturbed. To accomplish this purpose Metro electoral districts having no relationship to local municipal boundaries would be created. I commented, "This plan seems to be working satisfactorily in the Winnipeg Metropolitan Area".

Since writing my Brief I have obtained a copy of "The Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg Review Commission., Report and Recommendations", dated February 1964. I am sure you are aware, Mr. Commissioner, of the findings of the said Commission, at page 18 of its report, - this recommendation: "That no change be made in the provisions of the Act providing for the composition and election of the Metropolitan Council". Under Chapter VII, page 32, the Commissioner declared, in part, - "Notwithstanding the number of recommendations which we have made in this report we have no hesitation in finding that, on the whole, the basic advantages of the local government system established by the Act have been demonstrated beyond question, even at this early date and may confidently be expected to provide a more effective organization of municipal services, whether regional or local in character, for the present and future inhabitants of this area." As a

matter of record the Metropolitan Winnipeg Act, with its provision for direct election of the Metro Councillors by the people was enacted by the Manitoba Legislature in 1960. Opposition to it by some of the local politicians, particularly those of the City of Winnipeg, was the reason for the recent appointment of the Commission which was headed by our own Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Lorne R. Cumming, Q.C., the other two commissioners being a barrister and a labor executive both of the City of Winnipeg. I have read this report in its entirety and believe that the information therein and the conclusions of the Commission amply bear out, or vindicate, the position taken by those of us who believe in a truly second level of municipal government for this area, one in which the governing body shall directly represent the people.

I have also, since writing my Brief, obtained a copy of the "Decisions and Recommendations" of The Ontario Municipal Board, dated January 20, 1953 which resulted in the enactment by the Legislature of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, 1953. I have carefully read this report of 91 pages of printed matter and find at page 85, "Proposed Constitution of the Metropolitan Council" that the recommendations of the O.M.B. were designed "to provide a purely temporary council during the critical initial period of operation under the proposed reorganization". The council recommended would have had only nine members, but it would have represented the City and the suburban municipalities in an equitable manner and on the basis

of population densities in the general urban areas of the thirteen municipalities at that time. The members of the Metro Council were to give their full time to it. Further that no member, officer, or employee of any local council or local board was to have been permitted to sit or vote as a member of the Metropolitan Council. This report also explicitly stated, "Members should not be considered to be the delegates or representatives of any local council and be permitted to sit on two municipal councils at the same time as in counties. So it was the Government of the day that made our Metro Council like a county council and not the recommendations of the Cumming Report. This fact, I believe, is not realized by many people.

I would like at this time to make some reference to education. The piecemeal method of building new schools is still very much with us. I referred to it beginning page 17, sub-paragraph (o). Whether sufficient debenture money should be made available to meet the requirements for new schools, or some other method of finding the money should be employed, I am not in a position to advise. I find that the Etobicoke Board of Education is now in danger of having the same kind of handicap imposed by the Metropolitan School Board in connection with the building of their new West Humber Collegiate, in the Thistletown area as they experienced with the Scarlett Heights Collegiate Institute, Reference No. 10 in my Brief. The Etobicoke Board of Education has always been close to the mark in prognosticating school populations in new collegiate

districts, in particular. Except for the unforeseeable contingencies occasioned by the building of new Separate Schools subsequent to the building of the public schools in some localities, and of which the Etobicoke Board had no prior knowledge, their accuracy in planning for public school needs has been very good. The Etobicoke Board officials are confident that by 1966 the new Humber Heights Collegiate will have 1600 pupils. I learn that now, before a decision is reached regarding debentures to be authorized, that Metro School Board headquarters takes the position that provision should only be made at this time for a collegiate to accommodate 1350 students. This would mean that ten classrooms required for 1966 would be cut off.

The Etobicoke Board of Education is buying 11 portable classrooms for the elementary schools at a cost of $8,000 each for next September and then will have 43 portables in use during next school year. Our Superintendent of Secondary Schools tells me that we shall have 17 portables at our collegiates next fall. At present we have 57 public schools and 11 collegiates with a total enrollment of 40,550 students, 29,433 of these in the public schools and 11,117 in secondary and vocational.

This method of financing new school construction is costing the taxpayers of the entire Metro area hundreds of thousands of dollars over a period of a few years.

I have expressed the opinion that the integrity of the area boards of education should be

preserved and that an equitable basis of representation of the area boards on the Metropolitan School Board shold be evolved. Because the Metro Board is primarily the clearing house for the area boards and the regulatory body in fiscal matters, and does not carry on public works on its own account for the local boards we said that there do not appear to be the same reasons for direct representation of the voters on the Metro School Board as there are for such representation on Metro Council.

In conclusion I shall repeat the final paragraph of my Brief: "A superbia wherein the suburban and the centre-urban communities are federated, - as in a democratic confederation enjoying direct representation by population, can do much to lessen the contrary political and financial stresses. In such a setting rapproachment between the "haves" and the "have-lesses" and between the die-hard amalgamationists and the champions of local government can be realized, - an entente based on cordiality and mutual introspection."

June 10, 1964

Dalton J. Little.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much, Mr. Little. I will now adjourn until 9:30 tomorrow morning.

---THE HEARING WAS THEN ADJOURNED UNTIL 9:30 A.M. ON JUNE 11th, 1964.

ROYAL COMMISSION

ON

METROPOLITAN TORONTO

HEARINGS

HELD AT

PARLIAMENT BLDGS.
TORONTO

VOLUME No.: DATE:

19 JUNE 11 19

OFFICIAL REPORTERS
ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.
BOARD OF TRADE BLDG.
11 ADELAIDE ST. W.
TORONTO

364-5865 364-7383

ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.
TORONTO, ONTARIO

ROYAL COMMISSION ON METROPOLITAN TORONTO

Hearings of the Royal Commission on Metropolitan Toronto, held at the Parliament Buildings, Toronto, Ontario, on Thursday, the 11th day of June, 1964 commencing at 10 A.M. et seq.

PRESENT:

H. CARL GOLDENBERG, O.B.E., Q.C.	- Commissioner
F. H. FINNIS	- Secretary
L. FELDMAN	- Research Officer
T. PLUNKETT	- Municipal Consultant

ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.
TORONTO, ONTARIO

INDEX TO SUBMISSIONS

DESCRIPTION	PAGES
BUREAU OF MUNICIPAL RESEARCH	1673 - 1689

* * * * *

---UPON RESUMING AT 9:30 A.M., JUNE 11th, 1964.

SUBMISSION OF THE BUREAU OF MUNICIPAL RESEARCH

APPEARANCES:

MR. M. D. GOLDRICK

MR. S. MILES

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Goldrick, are you ready to proceed?

MR. GOLDRICK: Yes, sir.

THE COMMISSIONER: The Bureau of Municipal Research.

MR. GOLDRICK: To start with we would like to thank the Commission for this opportunity to appear before you and to elaborate a little bit on the brief that we have turned in to you. I should say that we regret that a member of our executive who was to appear today was not able to come as he was called out of town so that our presentation this morning will be made by myself with the assistance of Mr. Miles of the Bureau staff.

What I would propose to do, with your leave is to summarize the brief that we have submitted to the Commission, drawing one or two conclusions from it, and then if there are any questions that you have we would be pleased to do what we can with them.

Our brief set out to do two things. First of all, we were concerned with the dependence of municipalities in Metropolitan Toronto, concerned with their dependence on industrial and commercial assessment. In our brief we sought to eliminate some of this dependence. In the second place, we wanted to

equalize or improve the distribution of fiscal resources throughout the Metropolitan Toronto area and the burden of our submission assumes the continuation of some sort of federal scheme of government in this area.

Now the first area, that is the eliminating of the dependence on industrial and commercial assessment, we attack it for the following reasons. First of all we felt that the need for municipalities to attract and retain industry and industrial assessment resulted in a quite obvious waste of municipal resources, if you like, through the competition of municipalities for assessment; their need for attaining this rule of thumb of 40% industrial - commercial assessment in terms of their total assessment.

Secondly, we are particularly concerned with this industrial - commercial assessment emphasis because of the success of some municipalities in Metro Toronto and the not quite successful efforts of other municipalities resulting in quite alarming disparities in taxable resources between municipalities. The range, I am sure you know, if from 71% in New Toronto, 71% industrial - commercial assessment, right down to 23% in East York and 9% in Forest Hill, which is a special case.

Thirdly, it occurs to us that the need for municipalities to have this industrial assessment distorts what probably is a natural pattern of industrial - commercial settlements throughout Metropolitan Toronto. Reference to a land use map in Toronto shows that there are these sort of patches of industrial

settlement in each of the thirteen area municipalities.

Now in some cases we don't dispute the fact that perhaps this is a logical pattern following the railroads or other transportation routes; but the fact is that the location of these industries, the reason for their location, is not necessarily limited to the best patterns of the distribution of this land use and by using the need for fiscal balance in the individual municipalities it may well lead to distortion of the best pattern of distribution of this land use throughout Metro.

In addition, there is what seems to be quite a serious problem in that each municipality, in anticipation of a good balance of assessment, must leave considerable vacant land which is zoned for industrial purposes. I know in one brief in the City of Toronto there was a figure of 23,000 acres of what was termed "surplus industrial land", which is present and will be present for a good number of years in various municipalities. The problem is particularly pointed out, I think, in Scarborough which seems to be off the beaten track, or off the track of the trend of industrial and commercial assessment, which seems to favour the northwest sector of Metro and the western sector of Metro. The likelihood is that in Scarborough all the great quantities of land set aside for industrial development will never really be filled up.

Finally, our concern with dependence on industrial and commercial assessment is due to the fact

that the industrial assessment really is a regional tax resource, if you like. There seems to be no reason why the requirements of municipal finance and municipal tax policy condition the benefits from this industrial assessment falling to the sole benefit of the municipality in which the industrial development is located. Rather industry in Metro Toronto, it seems to us, should benefit the entire area since it is in effect a regional economic area that we are taking about.

For these reasons we think that the division of industrial and commercial assessment throughout Metropolitan Toronto is not a good thing and we propose to eliminate the dependence of municipalities on this form of assessment by pooling business and commercial property taxes. That is, we would propose that the Metropolitan Corporation, for instance, would be the collection agency, if you like, for business and commercial property taxes. It would, in effect, be a common cash register in which the proceeds from the forms of taxes would be collected.

Now our second aim in this brief was to equalize to as great an extent as possible the benefits of this commercial tax resource and in assuming the continuation of the federal structure in Metropolitan Toronto this equalization is a necessary thing. In the amalgamated form of government in Metropolitan Toronto the question of the problem of equalization would naturally be taken care of through the very nature of the organization and all former municipalities in Metropolitan Toronto would have equal access to the

benefits of this form of tax resource. Since amalgamation is only one possibility in the future development or form of government in Metro, we feel that there was merit in commenting on the possibilities or the way in which equalization could be brought about if a federal scheme were adopted or continued.

Now the problems, as we see it, was to disperse from this central pool all business and commercial property taxes, sums of money according to a formula to each member of the federation, or each borough or area municipality, whatever it is called.

We attempted to do this equalization and this sharing of this tax resource according to six different formulæ which we tested.

The first one that we tested was the distribution of these taxes by population and we tried to do this in five different ways. I won't go through the figures that we developed for each one of these formula. What I will do, if I may, is simply mention the six different ways we attempt to distribute the money and then summarize the result.

The first way, as I say, was through population. The second way was a formula which took into consideration the number of pupils or the pupil population either under the present consideration with thirteen municipalities or under a four or five borough scheme. The third way was distribution according to assessment. The fourth way was through distribution through pupils weighted by a weighting factor of pupils according to assessment. Next was distribution through

payment of the present maintenance assistance grant from these pooled industrial taxes and the balance paid according to assessment. Finally we tested a formula through which the proceeds of simply the business tax and not the property tax on industrial and commercial properties would be distributed.

There are other ways we would like to have tested which we didn't and which I think in any formula that would be developed should be included perhaps. One in particular that I think of is the cost of welfare. The importance of this has been decreased somewhat through the sharing, if you like, of welfare expenditures which came into effect January 1st, of this year, but any formula of distribution which attempts to recognize the needs of the recipients of the payments from the central pool should recognize the momentum of welfare expenditures.

Another factor which could have been taken into consideration and built into a formula with some difficulty, I imagine, I don't quite know how it would be done, some factor which recognized the obsolescence in the public and private plant in the various municipalities which were to receive monies from this source. This is perhaps a very settled factor but it is a very important one and a great deal of the expenditures of some of the older municipalities are now having to be applied to renewing public facilities, such as sidewalks, roads and of course the City of Toronto has an immense bill for the renewal of many sewers and the pairing of many sewers.

In our attempts to equalize the tax resources of the area municipalities or boroughs we took into account these six factors which seem to us to reflect in different degrees the needs of the various municipalities for additional tax resources and their ability to raise taxes from the resources that they presently have. I should say right now that none of the various alternatives that we attempted were completely satisfactory and in a number of different ways they did not measure up. I suppose the most important one was through their practical practicality. The problems that we ran into were a peculiar type. The most important one, I think, is the relative wealth -- and I hesitate to say "poverty" -- but to make a distinction, the relative wealth and relative poverty of the municipalities in Metropolitan Toronto. For instance, any formula which recognized or took into account residential assessment would naturally favour the Village of Forest Hill; whereas if the formula were taking into account the ratio of pupils to assessment Scarborough and North York and York Township would be favoured; Forest Hill would not be favoured. If industrial assessment were built into any formula of distribution Toronto and New Toronto and Leaside would naturally be favoured. There seem to be so many variables that had to be taken into account that no one factor was a neat solution to the problem of distributing the money we had drawn together into the common cash register.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Goldrick, when

you say that the five or six formulas which you worked on and you found that none of them was completely satisfactory, I am interested in the word "completely" because I don't know that you will find any formula that will be completely satisfactory under any circumstances. You mean they were not satisfactory?

MR. GOLDRICK: They were not satisfactory.

THE COMMISSIONER: They did not achieve what you wanted to achieve, which is more equality in resources among the area municipalities?

MR. GOLDRICK: Perhaps I should qualify that. They certainly were able to bring about greater equalization, but in doing so they also create tremendous shifts, shall we say, in the amount of monies that are now presently flowing to a municipality, which under any one of the formula would no longer flow and would be distributed to other municipalities. Certainly they equalize the resources of the area municipalities, or the members of the federation, but in terms of practicality it seemed to us that many of them were wanting in very many ways.

For instance, one of the formula -- I cannot recall exactly which one it was -- I think under pupils, the formula which had pupils weighted by pupils to assessment, the City of Toronto lost a huge sum of money, something in the order of 20 to 25 million dollars, which by itself obviously was not a practical solution to the problem.

THE COMMISSIONER: You used another

term. You said that some formulae favoured some municipalities and others favoured others. Well, you would expect that. You want the formula to favour those that should be favoured. What you really mean is in establishing a greater degree of equality they were creating new problems by taking too much away from those that were presently unduly favoured. Is that what you mean?

MR. GOLDRICK: Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: You must expect to favour those that are presently very unequal in resources.

MR. GOLDRICK: This is very true. In any equalization this is obviously going to happen. I suppose what concerns me is in the terms of the practicalness of these things it did too good a job, really levels things out.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I agree with you. I read the results. I want to repeat you cannot have a formula to create greater equality without favouring those that have been very unequal.

MR. GOLDRICK: Exactly. It is an interesting point. I suppose it is a very pragmatic thing, the extent to which something is good and therefore possible.

I was mentioning two problems we ran into, the difference in the nature of the wealth and poverty in the area municipalities. I was going to mention the point that in any equalization it is inevitable this shift has to come about. In fact that

is what you are trying to do. So this is where we left it. We showed what the effect of these different formula would be.

We conclude by saying that it might well be that a combination of the formulae that we have suggested, at least the factors we are trying to emphasize, could be built into some sort of formula which would satisfy the different criteria of practicalness which would be required. I think in these factors of population, pupils, assessment, welfare and so on that there are the elements of a formula which could be worked out and which would equalize the members or tax resources of the various members of the federation.

This leads to the conclusion that equalization is necessary and that amalgamation would bring this about in a federation of boroughs. It seems to me there would be some equalization just in the very fact of consolidated units of local government into a fewer number of municipal units in Metropolitan Toronto, but that something more than this would have to be done if the resulting federation were to be a viable arrangement of governments.

There seem to be two possibilities other than amalgamation which suggest themselves. The first one is the transfer of functions to the second tier, to the Metropolitan Corporation. This would be a continuation of a trend which has been going on since the inception of Metro and is one which to a limited extent could assist in the equalization or effect

equalization of tax burdens throughout the Metropolitan area.

I think that in a continuation of this trend you run into the very real danger that the area municipalities will be left with so few duties and responsibilities that it may very well injure their responsible municipal governments.

The other way is through the redistribution of financial resources and in addition to the redistribution of taxes, as we have tested, there is another alternative. That is through planning and control. It might very well be if the trend of industrial development is towards the west of Toronto that through planning measures or inducements industry and commercial development might be encouraged to settle in the areas of Metro which are less favoured with this type of development at this time.

The redistribution of taxes, I think, is a very likely way that equality might be brought about and I would emphasize that and if it is at all possible any formula which would be adopted should emphasize the needs of the recipients of the monies that are dispersed, rather than a formula which would be a standard formula for all municipalities.

A very good illustration of the problems you seem to run into is the maintenance assistance grants now where a set sum per pupil is distributed and which really doesn't recognize need at all. Some municipalities are profiting, if you like, from monies which they would quite well be able to raise

through their own tax resources.

This is the way we left it and I would be happy now to answer or elaborate on any points that you might like to ask.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Dr. Goldrick. Is it not probable if we were to try and take into account all the factors that would have to be taken into account to achieve a high degree of equality that the formula would become so complicated that administration would be difficult; more than that the public would not understand it?

MR. GOLDRICK: Yes, this is a strong likelihood. I remember a submission made to you, I think by the Township of York, where what sounded like a great formula was proposed. I think that nothing less than a skilled mathematician would understand it. It might be that by trying to bring together the elements that we have tested in here that you might wind up with an incomprehensible formula. The importance of this is great. It is, of course, a balancing thing between the benefits of a formula which did equalize conveniently and well, against the need for the public to understand the formula. I would think that probably on balance a good formula, which redistributed equitably, would probably be a more important factor than universal understanding of the formula proposed.

THE COMMISSIONER: Well, you may be right. I don't suppose you have to have one that every taxpayer or elector understands, but if it is too

complicated I suggest it would not create harmony within the area, certainly not during election campaigns.

Now you also suggested that a distribution of grants, or whatever redistribution there is, should be related to a greater degree of need. That is not done now, am I right, under the municipal grant system in Ontario? I am distinguishing between for municipal purposes and school grants. In the case of school grants there is some attempt to relate to need. That is not the case in municipal grants.

MR. GOLDRICK: With the exception of unconditional grants. Unconditional grants do. There are some larger for larger municipalities in recognition of their greater expenditures for administration of justice and welfare, for instance.

THE COMMISSIONER: That is not exactly what you and I are talking about. They are uniform for all municipalities?

MR. GOLDRICK: That is right.

THE COMMISSIONER: And there is a Province in Canada where the reverse is applied, where the larger the population the lower the grant. That is British Columbia, represented unofficially today by my friend Dr. Robert Clark. I stress the word "unofficially".

MR. GOLDRICK: Yes. As I say, need has to be recognized if great sums of money are being redistributed throughout Metro. For instance, to have to do that by a standard formula just would not

accomplish the objective you are setting out to accomplish.

THE COMMISSIONER: I agree with you. I did not disagree with your suggestion. I was just drawing attention to the fact that is not really applied under the present municipal grant system here or in the other Provinces as far as I know and, of course, that would create problems trying to do this.

MR. GOLDRICK: Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Now you say in your brief, and you have repeated it, that if total amalgamation were effected, equalization would be achieved. That is clear. Then you said that there are alternatives and first you mentioned transfer of more responsibilities and functions from area municipalities to the Metropolitan municipalities. You said that would to a degree create more equalization. Of course it could do it to a great degree, depending on the services that are transferred. Is that not right?

MR. GOLDRICK: Yes; and the division of responsibility for particular services.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. In your brief on page 8, paragraph number one, at the bottom of the page, and appendices one and two, which are referred to there, you use the term "under amalgamation of the present thirteen municipalities". You use "amalgamation" again in appendix two.

MR. GOLDRICK: Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Do you really mean

"amalgamation" there?

MR. GOLDRICK: No, I am sorry. I should have mentioned that, and I am glad you raised it. We have amended that in our later copies of this to say "partial fiscal amalgamation" which I hope is a little more clear.

THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I understood that, but I really thought if the Press reports this there might be --

MR. GOLDRICK: I will say loud and clear, "partial fiscal amalgamation" and in the heading it should be "under partial fiscal amalgamation of the present thirteen municipalities".

THE COMMISSIONER: Can you tell me of any instance where there is a redistribution of commercial and industrial assessment within a municipal area?

MR. GOLDRICK: Well, yes. There are three examples that I know of.

THE COMMISSIONER: In the United States?

MR. GOLDRICK: Well, the examples I was thinking of, one was in Winnipeg.

THE COMMISSIONER: Of the business tax?

MR. GOLDRICK: Of the business tax, right. The system itself of redistribution, the principle of it seems to have worked quite well. Where there seems to have been trouble was in the determination of the percentage of business revenues, business tax revenues, that were to be redistributed.

THE COMMISSIONER: It is easy to redistribute the business tax. I know the problem of Winnipeg because I dealt with that. I was really thinking of the property tax, commercial and industrial property tax.

MR. GOLDRICK: Right. The only other example that I am familiar with is something which is, I suppose, quite different in Alberta. In effect, the Foundation Plan, whereby I believe all the properties, industrial and commercial property taxes, from throughout the Province are collected at a provincial level and redistributed to the municipalities throughout the Province. Is that not correct?

THE COMMISSIONER: No.

MR. GOLDRICK: Is it business taxes?

THE COMMISSIONER: No. There was legislation introduced to redistribute commercial and industrial taxation through provincial collection, but that was not proceeded with.

MR. GOLDRICK: I see. You have shot me dead on two of them. I will hit the third one, in Germany.

THE COMMISSIONER: I haven't been there.

MR. GOLDRICK: This is again a little bit different than industrial tax, which I believe is set on net profits, and that is distributed from industrial communities to suburban dormitory suburbs.

In the reference I saw to it, it was distributed on the basis of 100 marks a year per person

ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.
TORONTO, ONTARIO

working in the industrial enclave and working in the dormitory suburbs. But even so, apparently there are sufficient incentives to increase industrial assessment that the equalizing effect of this is just not as effective as they hoped. I am not familiar with other ones in the United States.

THE COMMISSIONER: There have been various proposals. It has been considered, different kinds. I had occasion to consider it in Alberta, and it is a very difficult thing to try to put into effect.

MR. GOLDRICK: Well, we refer to a study of it that was done by the National Tax Association, and they recommended that a distribution on the basis of population be studied. As we have shown here, there are again tremendous shifts in industrial taxes if it were distributed by population, which seems to suggest, in Metro anyway, it would have to be modified somewhat.

THE COMMISSIONER: I have no further questions, Mr. Goldrick. Thank you for the careful study you made. Perhaps I may have occasion to ask you for some further studies as I go along.

MR. GOLDRICK: Fine. Well, I would like to thank you for our hearing today and also the very great consideration you have shown us as these studies develop and your hearings proceeded.

THE COMMISSIONER: This concludes the public hearings of this Commission. I just want to take advantage of this occasion to thank all who

have appeared here for their helpful contributions, and to the Press for the very full reporting which I think--which I know--was in the public interest.

My own task is not completed. Again I thank everyone, and we now adjourn sine die.

---WHEREUPON THE HEARING ADJOURNED SINE DIE.